

# Modern Philology

Vol. I.

January, 1904.

No. 3.

## A NEGLECTED SOURCE OF CORNEILLE'S HORACE.

In *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XV, coll. 283-303, I have brought conclusive evidence showing that in the composition of this tragedy *La mort de Pompée* Corneille was indebted to Amyot's translation of Plutarch, though Amyot's name was not mentioned by him.

A similar indebtedness exists for *Horace*. Here the first editions of the tragedy contained no reference to any source whatever, while those appearing between 1648 and 1656 were preceded by chaps. 23-26 of Book I of Livy's *History of Rome*, and this account of the duel between the Horatii and Curiatii for the supremacy of their respective cities has naturally been looked upon ever since as the source of the play. A recent study of the tragedy led me to draw Amyot's Plutarch from my shelves, and to my great surprise I found distinct evidence that here also Corneille had been working with his Amyot apparently open before him. In the case of *Pompée* the verbal agreement was too close to admit of doubt. In the present instance the verbal indebtedness is smaller, yet a comparison of the three texts will show clearly that Amyot's version of Plutarch's account of the same incident, related in the life of Tullus Hostilius, chaps. 8-21, was well known to Corneille, and that portions of the play rest upon suggestions received there.

Act I, scenes 1 and 2, contain dialogues between the women Sabine, Camille, Julie), and merely prepare the plot. The first

opportunity for a comparison of the play with its sources is found in the speech of Curiace in scene 3 (ll. 279 ff.). The Alban soldier here relates to Camille the manner in which the idea of settling the difficulty by a single combat had originated. He reports that the proposition to decide the question at issue otherwise than through a general battle, which would weaken both the victor and the vanquished, was made by the Alban commander, whom Corneille calls *dictateur*, agreeing with both Livy and Plutarch. In both sources the plan is outlined in a lengthy speech, which Corneille imitates without following either slavishly. In the ancient authors the main reason advanced by the Alban for such an arrangement is the need of defense against a common enemy that is threatening them. Let them unite against that danger, and not make war upon each other, who are relatives and neighbors. This is also the pith of the argument advanced in the play, ll. 285 ff., and, so far as the language is concerned, either Livy or Plutarch would be a sufficient source. With Corneille, however, the relationship of the two armies is the pivot, and this thought, though present in Livy, is much more elaborated by Plutarch, so that, so far as the spirit of the speech is concerned, Corneille seems somewhat more in touch with the latter than with the former. Two lines even contain a suggestion of Amyot's language (cf. ll. 295, 296):

Nos ennemis communs attendent avec joie  
Qu'un des partis défait leur donne l'autre en proie,

and Amyot:

nos ennemis communs profitent de nos divisions et conspirent contre nous.

However, the verbal similarity may be due to accident, and Livy presents the same thought:

Memor esto, jam quum signum pugnae dabis, has duas acies spectaculo fore, ut fessos confectosque, simul victorem ac victum aggrediantur.

The proposition is then made by the Alban chief to select champions on either side, who by a single combat shall determine which of the two nations is the victor in the war. The offer is accepted, it is agreed that there shall be three representatives for each people, and an armistice is declared, during which the officers

of the two armies shall decide upon the proper champions (ll. 307-27).

Livy relates the same proposition to decide the war with less bloodshed:

*ineamus aliquam viam, qua utri utris imperent, sine magna clade, sine multo sanguine<sup>1</sup> utriusque populi decerni possit.*

However, the manner in which the kings are led to rest their choice upon the champions that are finally selected is somewhat different. He continues:

*forte in duobus tum exercitibus erant tergemini fratres, nec aetate nec viribus dispares. . . . Cum tergeminis agunt reges, ut pro sua quisque patria dimicent ferro.*

That is to say, Livy's account appears to be the reverse of that of Corneille. With the latter it is first determined that there shall be three champions on each side, and during the armistice the two trios are selected to fill the rôle. In Livy the first decision is merely to intrust the whole controversy to specially selected representatives, and when this has been agreed upon, the number seems to be an after-thought.

Plutarch's account of the agreement accords in this particular with that of Corneille. The Alban dictator "proposa de décider le différend par les armes. Cet avis fut généralement approuvé. Mais on n'étoit pas d'accord sur le nombre des combattans." Tullus then proposes to select one representative on each side, and suggests that he himself fight the duel for the Romans, and the Alban dictator for his people. But this proposal is rejected by the Alban:

*Il concluoit qu'il falloit choisir de chaque côté trois champions pour combattre à la vue des deux armées; et pour donner plus d'autorité à son sentiment, il ajoutoit que le nombre de trois étoit un nombre très propre pour décider toutes sortes de contestations, parcequ'il comprend un commencement, un milieu, et une fin.*

This proposition meets with approval, and in consequence the Horatii and Curiatii are selected to represent their respective cities.

It is evident Corneille's arrangement of the story agrees with

<sup>1</sup>Cf. CORNEILLE, "à moins de sang," l. 305.

Plutarch rather than with Livy. At the same time, several of Corneille's lines reflect quite closely the thought of Livy. Compare—

Que chaque peuple aux siens attache sa fortune;  
Et suivant ce que d'eux ordonnera le sort,  
Que le foible parti prenne loi du plus fort

(ll. 308-10)

with Livy: "*ibi imperium fore, unde victoria fuerit . . . ut cujus populi cives eo certamine vicissent, is alteri populo cum bona pace imperitaret . . .*"

The time elapsing between this proposition and the final choice of the champions, which fills up in Corneille the interval between the first and second acts, is suggested by both the ancient authors. However, Livy merely says, "*cum tergemini agunt reges*," while Plutarch devotes some space to their family history. They were sons of Alban twin sisters, the one married to a Roman called Horace, the other to an Alban by the name of Curiace. When asked to accept the honor offered them, the Curiatii at once signify their readiness to do so. The Horatii are equally eager, but they ask for time to obtain the permission of their father. All this is absent from Corneille's play, and one wonders why he did not make use of this admirable opportunity to picture at length the attitude of the older Horace before the battle. Perhaps the last line of Act II, in which the father says to his son and Curiace, "*Faites votre devoir, et laissez faire aux dieux*" (l. 710), is an echo of this portion of Amyot: "*Allez, généreux enfants, je vous donne mon consentement; allez porter à Tullus une réponse digne de vous.*" In Livy the old father does not appear until after the victory.

The next passage in which Corneille follows his sources directly occurs in Act III, scene 2, when Julie gives an account of the beginning of the duel, ll. 779 ff. Here Plutarch is much more elaborate, and it seems evident that Corneille has followed him. When the brothers, ready for battle, advanced toward each other, Livy merely says: "*horror ingens spectantes perstringit.*" Plutarch goes into details:

Un spectacle si touchant tire des larmes aux spectateurs, ils accusent leurs généraux de cruauté, et se reprochent à eux-mêmes d'avoir obligé



des parens à s'égorger les uns les autres pour les intérêts publics, tandis qu'ils auroient pu sans conséquence donner à d'autres une si triste commission.

Compare Corneille, ll. 781-84:

Sitôt qu'ils ont paru, prêts à se mesurer,  
On a dans les deux camps entendu murmurer:  
À voir de tels amis, des personnes si proches,  
Venir pour leur patrie aux mortelles approches.

A little farther on Amyot continues:

Mais dès qu'on les vit aux mains, on entendit de part et d'autre un grand bruit mêlé d'acclamations, de vœux, d'exhortations, d'applaudissemens, de gémissemens, et l'air retentissoit de leurs cris militaires.

This passage has evidently inspired ll. 785-92:

L'un s'émeut de pitié, l'autre est saisi d'horreur,  
L'autre d'un si grand zèle admire la fureur;  
Tel porte jusqu'aux cieus leur vertu sans égale,  
Et tel l'ose nommer sacrilège et brutale.  
Ces divers sentimens n'ont pourtant qu'une voix:  
Tous accusent leurs chefs, tous détestent leur choix;  
Et ne pouvant souffrir un combat si barbare,  
On s'écrie, on s'avance, enfin on les sépare.

The momentary separation of the champions which now follows (ll. 808-27), to give the two kings the opportunity to consult again the wish of the gods through a sacrifice, is an invention of Corneille. There is nothing in Livy that in the slightest degree hints at such a delay. Plutarch also presents nothing similar, yet it is not impossible that the elaborate way in which he describes the feelings of the two armies may have suggested to Corneille the supposition of a temporary armistice.

The story is continued in the speech of Valère, ll. 1104 ff. In the description of the battle Corneille plainly follows Livy, with evident translation of the Latin text; cf. ll. 1131-33:

J'en viens d'immoler deux aux mânes de mes frères;  
Rome aura le dernier de mes trois adversaires,  
C'est à ses intérêts que je vais l'immoler,

and Livy: "duos . . . fratrum manibus dedi: tertium causae belli hujusce, ut Romanus Albano imperet, dabo." The account

of Plutarch varies fundamentally here (cf. chap. xvi), though at the end he refers to the version contained in Livy as that commonly current among historians.

The close similarity with Plutarch begins again with Act IV, scene 5, when Horace returns to his home, laden with the spoils of his victims. Both Plutarch and Livy agree in relating that he met his sister before the gates of Rome. This variation from the sources was demanded by the unity of place; the stage direction to this scene, "Proculé portant en sa main les trois épées des Curiaces," is plainly a translation of Livy's "*tergemina spolia prae se gerens*." Now, Livy merely relates here that at this sight the sister burst out into tears, "*solvit crines et flebiliter nomine sponsum mortuum appellat*," whereupon Horatius, moved by sudden anger, killed the girl.

Plutarch tells that Horace thought the sister had come out to meet him in order to congratulate him on his victory:

Il crut que c'étoit l'empressement de le complimenter sur sa victoire, et d'apprendre les circonstances du combat, qui l'avoit fait passer par dessus les règles de la bienséance, qui obligent une jeune fille à se tenir toujours sous les yeux de ses parens.

The thought of the merited congratulation is evidently present in ll. 1255 and 1256:

Vois ces marques d'honneur, ces témoins de ma gloire,  
Et rends ce que tu dois à l'heur de ma victoire.

Then Plutarch describes her attitude, when she saw the evidences of her lover's death:

. . . elle déchire ses habits, elle se frappe la poitrine, elle répand des larmes, et appelle son cousin; l'air retentit de ses gémissements. Après avoir pleuré la mort de l'Albain qu'elle aimoit, elle arrête ses yeux sur son frère, et lui fait les reproches les plus sanglans.

The suggestions contained in this passage, entirely absent from Livy, are elaborated in the attitude and words of Camille, ll. 1262-1318.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note, in passing, that the famous passage, ll. 1301-18, in which Camille hur's malediction upon Rome, is an imitation of a similar outburst in MAIRET's *Sophonisbe*, ll. 1854-64; cf. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Corneille*, *Horace* (Hachette & Co.), p. 41.

Finally Horace is carried away by anger and stabs his sister. Both ancient authors agree here in substance as to the words uttered by him as he sees his sister fall. Yet Corneille's

Ainsi reçoive un châtiment soudain  
Quiconque ose pleurer un ennemi romain  
(ll. 1321-22)

reflects Amyot's "Puisse toute Romaine qui ose pleurer un ennemi avoir le même sort, et périr d'une mort aussi tragique," rather than Livy's "sic eat quaecumque Romana lugebit hostem."

Further evidence of the influence of Amyot becomes apparent in the scene in which the older Horace is confronted with his son after the murder of Camille, Act V, scene 1. According to Livy, Horace was at once led before the king, and his trial begun. Plutarch relates that the young man went from the scene of the murder "plein d'une indifférence sauvage du même pas à la maison de son père." Then he continues:

Horace le père, digne d'un tel fils, reçut le vainqueur et le parricide avec des transports de joie qu'on ne peut exprimer. Ayant appris la mort de sa fille, loin d'y paroître sensible, il trouva, qu'elle avoit mérité un si triste sort, et que son fils s'étoit comporté en toutes choses comme un zélé citoyen.

Compare with this passage ll. 1405-18 of the play, in which the father gives voice to very similar sentiments.

The scene which follows contains the trial of Horace before the king. Here Livy relates that the king handed him over to duumvirs with instructions to find him guilty of high treason, at the same time advising him to appeal from their judgment to the people. Plutarch again describes the whole scene more in detail, and in fact seems to contain in outline the whole trial scene of Act V. He relates that Horace is brought to the king by

quelques-uns des premiers de la ville . . . pour lui demander justice du sang de sa sœur dont il s'était souillé. L'accusation fut vive, et soutenue de fortes raisons. On cita les loix qui défendoient de tuer: elles étoient formelles; et à les suivre à la rigueur, Horace méritoit la mort.

Here lies, unless we are much mistaken, the kernel from which has sprung the speech of Valère, ll. 1481-1534.

Plutarch continues that the king, not knowing what to do in this predicament, decided to hand him over to duumvirs, that Horace then appealed upon his advice, and that his father pleaded his cause with vehemence. The same facts are reported by Livy, but the substance of the father's argument is not identical with that outlined by Plutarch. Both accounts are, however, of the greatest interest in the present discussion, for a scrutiny of the speech of the older Horace, ll. 1631-1728, reveals the fact that Corneille has utilized them both, joining them freely together, but without obliterating the traces.

The speech is divided into sections addressed to the different persons prominent in the action. First comes an answer to Sabine's accusation of Horace (ll. 1635-47), which is invented, as is the character of Sabine. Then the father turns to the king and answers the arguments of Valère (ll. 1647-74). Here Corneille plainly follows suggestions found in Plutarch:

Son père plaïda sa cause avec véhémence. Il soutint que l'action que son fils avoit faite ne devoit point passer pour un meurtre, mais une juste vengeance; qu'il étoit le père de l'accusé et de celle pour qui on demandoit justice; que le malheur, s'il y en avoit, le regardoit lui seul; qu'il étoit le juge le plus compétent des affaires de sa maison, et que s'il eût cru son fils coupable, il l'eût lui-même condamné et puni de son autorité paternelle. . . .

The passage in Corneille is too long to be cited in full; I will point out merely the lines in which the imitation is particularly evident:

. . . ce bras paternel  
L'auroit déjà puni s'il étoit criminel;  
J'aurois su mieux user de l'entière puissance  
Que me donnent sur lui les droits de la naissance.  
(ll. 1657-60)

Qui le fait se charger des soins de ma famille?  
Qui le fait, malgré moi, vouloir venger ma fille?  
Et par quelle raison, dans son juste trépas,  
Prend-il un intérêt qu'un père ne prend pas?  
(ll. 1667-70)

Then the older Horace turns to Valère, and again to the king (ll. 1675-1710); and here Corneille just as plainly follows the suggestions of Livy:

Orabat deinde, ne se, quem paulo ante cum egregia stirpe conspexissent, orbum liberis facerent. . . . Huncine aiebat quem modo decoratum ovantemque victoria incedentem vidistis, Quirites, eum sub furca vinctum inter verbera et cruciatus videre potestis? quod vix Albanorum oculi tam deforme spectaculum ferre possent. I, lictor, colliga manus, quae paulo ante armatae imperium populo romano pepererunt. I, caput obnube liberatoris urbis hujus; arbori infelici suspende; verbera, vel intra pomoerium, modo inter illam pilam et spolia hostium, vel extra pomoerium, modo inter sepulcra Curiatorum. Quo enim ducere hunc juvenem potestis, ubi non sua decora eum a tanta foeditate supplicii vindicent.

With this passage should be compared particularly ll. 1687-1700:

Où penses tu choisir un lieu pour son supplice?  
Sera-ce entre ces murs que mille et mille voix  
Font résonner encor du bruit de ses exploits?  
Sera-ce hors des murs, etc.

And again ll. 1705-8:

Sire, ne donnez rien à mes débiles ans:  
Rome aujourd'hui m'a vu père de quatre enfants;  
Trois en ce même jour sont morts pour sa querelle;  
Il m'en reste encore un, conservez-le pour elle.

The attitude of the younger Horace during the whole trial is passed over in silence by Livy. Plutarch describes it as follows:

Pendant que ses accusateurs pressoient ses juges de le condamner à mort, et lors même que sa sentence étoit prononcée, il étoit aussi tranquille que s'il se fût agi d'une chose indifférente.

In the face of the decided influence of Amyot in the scene, it is not impossible that the speech of Horace, ll. 1535-94, owes part of its spirit, at least, to the passage from Plutarch just cited.

A final instance of the influence of Plutarch seems to occur in the directions given by Tulle for the purification of Horace. Livy merely mentions the fact: "imperatum patri ut filium expiaret. . . ." Plutarch says: "Il [*i. e.*, Tullus] fit donc venir les pontifes et leur ordonna d'appaiser la colère des dieux et des génies. . . ." Compare with this passage ll. 1770-76 of the play:

Mais nous devons aux dieux demain un sacrifice,  
Et nous aurons le ciel à nos vœux mal propice  
Si nos prêtres, avant que de sacrifier,

Ne trouvoient les moyens de le purifier :  
Son père en prendra soin ; il lui sera facile  
D'apaiser tout d'un temps les mânes de Camille.

This comparison will have proved, I think, the assertion made at the beginning of this article. The actual additions to the interpretation of Corneille's tragedy are small, and yet the point is of interest, because it allows us to see Corneille at work.

That he knew Amyot's Plutarch goes without saying; in fact, it were strange if he had not read him. That he should have used him without even once mentioning his name is probably to be accounted for by the fact that Amyot had practically become a French classic, a modern author, whose name did not belong in the same category as those of classical writers.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY.

## ELEMENTS OF MAGIC IN THE ROMANCE OF WILLIAM OF PALERNE.

ABOUT the year 1350, at the command of Sir Humphrey Bohun, the French *Roman de Guillaume de Palerne* was translated into English by one William, of whom we know nothing but this name. The translator was unusually faithful to his original, omitting nothing essential and making no important addition; though he greatly increased the poetic merit of the whole by adding, here and there, some bit of description or character portrayal, as unusual in the romances of the fourteenth century as the fresh humor which is William's undying charm.

Of the origin of the French *Roman* we know nothing. Sir F. Madden in his preface to the first modern edition of the English poem<sup>1</sup> makes the suggestion that the story was founded "on some Italian tradition picked up by the Norman adventurers in Apulia and Sicily;" thus taking for granted that in the French poem<sup>2</sup> of the last quarter of the twelfth century we have the earliest version of this delightful and unusual little romance.

It would seem necessary, before turning to the discussion of the subject of this paper, to give a brief synopsis of the story embodied in both versions of the romance. Short portions of the first part of the English version are missing, so that it is necessary to supply the corresponding parts from the French. As the stories are identical, however, in all other parts, it is both safe and easy to use the original version.

Although William of Palerne bears the title rôle in this romance, he is not, in my opinion, the real hero of the story. Alphouns, the Werwolf, who does, in fact, appear in the second title of the English poem, is undoubtedly its most interesting, indeed its central, character. His story is briefly as follows: His father was the king of Spain, a just and kindly man. At Alphouns's birth his mother died, and in course of time the king married

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in the Introduction to the Early English Text Society edition, Extra Series I, p. xiv.

<sup>2</sup>Société des Anciens Textes Français, ed. H. MICHELANT, 1876.



again. The new queen was a woman renowned for her occult wisdom and the power of her magic charms. She seemed, for a time, merely indifferent to the boy Alphouns; but, after the birth of a son, she grew jealous on his behalf and determined to remove the king's elder son from her boy's path to the throne. By means of a magic salve and charms she transformed Alphouns, therefore, to a werwolf, who, realizing his plight, very naturally rushed at the queen—

And hent her so hetterly to have hire astrangled  
 Pat hire deth was neis dist to deme pe sope.<sup>1</sup>

At her cries he fled, and thus began his many years of wandering, in his strange disguise.

One day Alphouns came to Sicily, and there discovered that the baby heir to the throne, William of Palerne, was about to be slain at the command of his wicked uncles. He seized the child, bore him across to Italy, and at last left him in the care of a kindly cowherd living near Rome.

For seven years the little William, always watched from a distance by his rescuer, lived happily with his foster parents. Then the werwolf, thinking it time his protégé should be advanced and educated, led the emperor of Rome, whom he found opportunely hunting in the forest, to the spot where William was tending his kine. Charmed with the unusual beauty of the boy, the emperor took him home and placed him under the care of his little daughter, Melior. The two, growing up together—always, though they knew it not, under the eye of the "witty werwolf"—not unnaturally fell in love, and, at last, upon the eve of a projected marriage between Melior and a Greek prince, ran away together, disguised by their clever little friend Alexandrine as two white bears.

Upon their arrival in the forest, the werwolf claimed them as his charge, and led the lovers—quite unconscious of his maneuvers—back to Sicily, William's native land. After many adventures and hair-breadth escapes from the eager pursuit, the pair reached the island, constantly guided, provided for, and consoled by their four-footed friend. Finding his mother and sister besieged by the king of Spain, William, without knowledge of his

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 150, 151.

relationship to them, at once espoused their cause, and, with a werwolf as device upon his shield, overthrew all that opposed him and reduced the king, not only to subjection, but to imprisonment.

Alphouns, the werwolf, who had meanwhile been absent, now reappeared and by his curious motions and obeisances before his father, the king of Spain, led him to think of his lost son and the rumors concerning his transformation into a werwolf. His step-mother, the queen, being promptly summoned, aroused a murderous rage in Alphouns, who was with difficulty restrained by William from rushing upon her at once. In terror, she confessed her guilt and her present readiness to make amends; retired with the werwolf, now quieted, and by means of a ring tied with a red thread about his neck, and the usual charms, restored him to humanity in the shape of a naked man. The story ends with the marriage of Alphouns to William's sister, Florence, of William to Melior, of the clever Alexandrine to Alphouns's half-brother, Braundins; the return of all to their homes; and, finally, the election of William, after the death of his father-in-law, to the empire of Rome.

Apart from its literary excellence, the characteristic which distinguishes this romance, as outlined above, and gives it a place all its own among the non-cyclic romances, is the great prominence it gives (1) to the element of magic, especially as expressed in the transformations of men into animals, and (2) to the influence of prophetic dreams. No less than five dreams, bearing directly upon the story and influencing its development, are related at length. Two of these are caused by the magic of the witch-like Alexandrine, to promote the love affair of William and Melior.<sup>1</sup> Two are prophetic of immediately ensuing events, the one leading to the escape of William and Melior from their pursuers, the other acquainting them with events occurring at a distance,<sup>2</sup> and the fifth, that of the queen of Palerne, longest and most elaborate of all, foretells, not only the coming of William and Melior in their second disguise as deer, and William's conquest of her enemies, but her son's final triumph as emperor of Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 657-77, 862-70.

<sup>2</sup> Ll. 2293-2313, 3104-7.

More interesting than the dreams, however, are the three cases of men's transformation into animals presented in this poem: the change of Alphouns into a werwolf, the change of William and Melior into white bears, and their and the queen's final change into deer. It is true, the last two metamorphoses mentioned are spoken of in the poem merely as disguises: William and Melior, determined to escape together for the sake of their love, appeal to the crafty Alexandrine to aid them in their departure. Alexandrine, having procured two white bearskins from the kitchen, sews up the lovers in the skins and sends them off on all fours.<sup>1</sup>

From this time until they change their disguise, William and Melior are most frequently mentioned by the poet as "the beres," and he seems throughout to lose consciousness of the fact that they had not actually undergone transformation.<sup>2</sup> The change from human to bear-nature was almost as common, especially in Germanic countries, as that to wolf-nature, as witness the Berserker of Scandinavia. A popular tradition of the sort, in which the transformation has been rationalized and Christianized (by the introduction of the devil!) is found in Grimm's "Bearskin" Tale 101—where "Bearskin" hardly retains any human characteristics during his seven years' compact with the Evil One. In this instance, as in that of the chief transformation in our poem, the werwolf, the man does not partake the character of the animal whose shape he assumes, but retains the better part of his human mind.

Having become notorious as bears, William and Melior, led always by the ready wisdom of their wolf-friend, reject the tell-tale white skins and assume those of a hart and hind, provided for them by Alphouns.<sup>3</sup> This would seem to be mere repetition in another form and hardly worth remark, were it not for a curious bit of additional detail which appears to corroborate the theory that the disguises of this poem must have been, in some earlier form of the story, actual animal transformations. This additional bit of evidence consists in the account of how the queen of Palerne, having seen the hart and hind in her garden, and having learned, through her dream, that these were to be her deliverers, herself

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 1686-1744.

<sup>2</sup> See l. 2401 and elsewhere.

<sup>3</sup> Ll. 2574-96.

put on a *deerskin* before going down to meet them.<sup>1</sup> Of course, this may be merely the elaboration of the poet, but it seems rather to bear the marks of early tradition. For why should the queen, if perfectly sure that the strangers were actual human beings, merely clothed in deerskins, not go to meet them in her proper costume? It seems an unanswerable question. If, on the other hand, the lovers were actually transformed into deer, they would very naturally be afraid of a human queen, but quite unafrighted by one of the same form as themselves. To primitive conceptions it was perfectly natural that the queen should herself become a deer, in assuming the deerskin, in order the better to parley with her deer-transformed guests. The fact, too, that transformations into the forms of animals or birds were, from the earliest times, often accomplished for the sake of speed falls in with this theory.<sup>2</sup> Strength, represented by the bears, and speed, represented by the deer, were both necessary to bring the lovers, William and Melior, from Rome to their asylum in Sicily, and to enable them to escape the vigilant pursuit and the manifold dangers of their journey.

Whether William, Melior, and the queen were or were not originally transformed into the creatures whose skins they wore, however, we have an actual transformation here which forms the central interest of the story for students today, as it doubtless did for the less analytical readers on whose account it was first set down in French and English. The werewolf, Alphouns, is, as I have said above, without doubt the real hero of the romance, combining in himself most strangely the characteristics of victim and *deus ex machina*, of wild beast and guardian angel.

Mr. Kirby F. Smith, in "An Historical Study of the Werewolf in Literature,"<sup>3</sup> mentions the *Lai de Bisclavret* and two other *lais* closely connected with it, as the only stories of the "constitutional werewolf" in which the author is on the side of the werewolf and enlists the sympathy of the reader on his behalf. We have in William a yet more conspicuous example of the glorifica-

<sup>1</sup> LL. 3059-71, 3110-19.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the story of the Swedish soldier Afzelius, UNGEWITTER, 2, 361, quoted by MR. K. F. SMITH, "The Werewolf," p. 23, note; also, p. 25. The gods of Scandinavia use the power of transformation "for the purpose of making rapid journeys."

<sup>3</sup> *Publications of Modern Language Association*, New Series, Vol. II (1894).

tion of the man-beast. His type is that of those involuntarily transformed; but, even among stories of such guiltless victims, sympathy on the part of the author is exceedingly rare.

It will have been seen in the synopsis of the story, not only that the attitude of the author is very unusual, but that the character of the werwolf himself is almost unprecedented. In only two instances does Alphouns show a resemblance in nature to the traditional werwolf: in his two meetings with the step-mother who transformed him. The ferocity and thirst for blood and the horrible gruesomeness which are the traits of the man-wolf from time immemorial are entirely absent here. He is most often spoken of as the "witty werwolf," and even when deeds of violence would be perfectly natural, as in stealing food for William and Melior, he harms no one. He rushes not upon a man "wip a rude roring," but lets him escape unhurt save for a grisly fright. "His wit welt he euer," in the full sense that not only could he reason and calculate with a man's mind, but he could feel with a man's heart. He was, in fact, no more truly transformed than William and Melior when they donned the bearskins as a disguise. And it may be added here that the unusual rationalization and humanization of the acknowledged magic change from man to werwolf is an additional argument in favor of the bear- and deerskin changes being originally actual transformations also.

This unusual characterization of the werwolf might arise from one of two causes: either directly from the influence of the author of the French romance, or from the late form of the story as it came to him. Since we have nothing earlier than the French version, and since our English poem is a direct translation of that, it is impossible actually to decide between these alternatives. It seems more probable, however, since the whole plot of the story as we have it hinges on the character of the werwolf, that wherever the poet found it, he found it in substantially its present shape. Of course, it is easy to imagine that, in an earlier form of the tradition, the theft of William by the werwolf had no other motive than the satisfaction of the latter's hunger, and that the child was afterward rescued by the cowherd with whom he passed his boyhood. If, as I have suggested, the earlier story had really transformed

the lovers into bears, they would then be fitting companions for a werwolf and their journeyings together were not unnatural. In the dearth of facts, however, it is only possible to say that the character of the werwolf would of itself be sufficient to stamp this story as very late, and it is impossible to do more than guess at its primitive form.

Let us turn, now, to a discussion of the various classes of werwolves and to the place of Alphouns among them. I shall first consider three general types of werwolf-transformations—for it is by their transformations that the classes are distinguished—and then try to show that the widely spread and various stories of swan-transformations can be placed in corresponding categories.

Mr. Kirby Smith, in his article on the werwolf, to which I have already had occasion to refer, makes two general divisions under which the werwolf stories that have come down to us from all ages can be grouped; these are the "voluntary," or "constitutional," werwolf, and the "werwolf by magic." The distinction between the two is sharply drawn, but no possibility of a connection is considered. For the purposes of this paper it would seem better to make three divisions, all more or less connected, yet each clearly distinct. Before describing them, however, I must state the fact that the use of magic charms and ointments which often accompanies one or other method of animal transformation is not in any way distinctive of these methods, but belongs to the general province of folk-magic, and will not therefore be more particularly considered here. In every instance of transformation, as here in the case of Alphouns, the charms and ointments have probably been added at a late date, after a sophisticated system of magic had been developed.

To return: the first of my three types is that so ably discussed by Mr. Kirby Smith—the constitutional type, or werwolf-by-nature. Here the change from man-form to wolf-form is purely voluntary<sup>1</sup> and occurs either at the option of the wolf-man or at fixed time intervals. The only condition necessary to the change

<sup>1</sup> "Voluntary" in the sense that, whether the change be periodic or not, *desire* for the change always precedes. The *wish* may recur at regular intervals, but, the nature of the man being twofold, the wish always precedes the act. Cf. *Lai de Bisclavret*.

is the removal of the man's clothes when he desires to become wolf, and his resumption of the same clothes to become man. Here the wolf-nature is distinctly predominant, and, as Mr. Smith says, the man is looked upon as "a demoniac wolf in disguise, a flimsy disguise which he may throw off at any moment." The best illustrations of this type are: the "Freedman's Tale" in Petronius, *Satire* 61, and the *Lai de Bisclavret* by Marie de France, both quoted by Mr. Kirby Smith. In the former a freedman sees a soldier, a friend of his, suddenly stop at a lonely place in the road, remove his clothes, emit a howl, and rush off into the woods in the form of a wolf. Later the freedman hears that a ravenous wolf has been among the cattle of another friend and has received a severe cut in the neck. On returning to the soldier's lodging, his friend finds him lying bathed in blood which pours from a great gash in his neck. The conclusion is evident: the man is a voluntary,<sup>1</sup> constitutional werwolf, and an object of horror ever after.

In Marie's *lai* a husband is guilty of frequent and mysterious absences from home, recurring at regular intervals. His wife, evidently acquainted with the habits of werwolves, having wormed from him the admission that he possesses the hated dual nature, begs him to tell her where he hides his clothes. After much hesitation he reveals the secret hiding-place, and to his sorrow. For when next the desire for transformation comes upon him, his wife follows him, steals his clothes, and leaves him powerless to regain his human shape. Afterward, by the intervention of King Arthur, he is restored and his unfaithful wife punished.<sup>2</sup>

The second method of transformation is that called "Teutonic" in Mr. Smith's article. The process is just the reverse of the former one. A man becomes a werwolf by putting on a "wolf-shirt"—or later a wolfskin girdle—and returns to human shape by removing it. Here, as in the first type, the change is usually voluntary, and occurs at either regular or irregular inter-

<sup>1</sup> See note on preceding page.

<sup>2</sup> See, in connection with this *lai*, the interesting article of PROFESSOR G. L. KITTEDGE appended to his recent edition of "Arthur and Gorlagon," a Latin version of a Welsh-Irish werwolf tale. The four versions of *The Werwolf's Tale* with which he deals all belong to the "constitutional" type with more or less admixture of later magic (*Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Vol. VIII, pp. 149 ff.).



vals.<sup>1</sup> It is usually periodic, the periods often connected with the number nine. In this type the human nature, on the whole, predominates, even though, as in the case related in the *Volsunga Saga* (chaps. 5-8), the werwolves are wolves for longer periods than they are men. Mr. Smith quotes this latter story. Sigmund and Sinfiötli "fared forth into the forest after spoil; and they came upon a house, and two men with great gold rings were sleeping therein. They were at the time free from a great ill, for wolf-shirts were hanging upon the wall above them; every tenth day they might get out of those shirts." Sigmund and Sinfiötli, having put on the shirts, found themselves unable to return to human form, and rushing forth into the forest, gave themselves up to ravage and murder for the prescribed nine days. Then they returned, burned the skins, and so relieved themselves and the king's sons of the fatal temptation to lead the wolf-life.

An Armenian story, into which later religious ideas have been introduced, shows the same fundamental characteristics. A woman, for her sins, is condemned to wander seven years as a wolf. A spirit robes her in wolf-clothes, which arouse in her wolf-appetites. She devours first her own children and those of her relatives, then the children of strangers. She rages only at night. When morning comes, she returns to her human shape and carefully conceals her wolfskin. Hertz says that this legend is so closely related to European, especially Slavic, werewolf legends that it almost seems as if it must have wandered into Armenia from Russia or Greece.<sup>2</sup>

The third type of transformation is distinguished from the first two by the fact that, in the large majority of cases, it is brought about by the power of some person other than the werewolf, and against his will. The change both to and from the wolf-form is accomplished by means of a ring or necklace, *i. e.*, a magic circle, usually of gold. It is not periodic, therefore, and frequently the man, once transformed, remains wolf to his death. A good illustration of this method is a story taken from the

<sup>1</sup> In these stories, however, it is taken for granted that *whoever* puts on the "wolf-shirt" will become wolf, while in the case of the first class the gift of change, depending on a dual nature, is purely personal.

<sup>2</sup> W. HERTZ, *Der Werewolf*, p. 27.

German-Jewish *Maase Buch*.<sup>1</sup> In this story a rabbi sees one day a curious-looking weasel with a large gold ring in its mouth. He captures the weasel, obtains the ring, and finds it to be a magic talisman capable of granting his wishes. All this he tells his wife, but keeps the ring from her. At last, and of course, she discovers the ring and gains possession of it. In revenge, probably, for her Goodman's lack of confidence in her, she promptly uses the powers of the captured ring to turn him into a wolf. He leaps out of the window and makes for the forest. The erewhile harmless rabbi now becomes a pest to the entire neighborhood, killing the cattle, threatening men's lives, and ravaging as no mere wolf could ravage. The king sets a price on his head, and a famous knight starts out to take him. When he reaches the depths of the forest he meets the wolf and struggles with it. Almost overcome, he resorts to prayer, and the wolf falls fawning at his feet. The knight having obtained the promised prize, the wolf remains with him till, one snowy day, he discovers the beast *writing Hebrew* with his paw on the snow. He hurries back to town, secures the king, and returns to the forest, where the wolf is awaiting him, his whole story scratched out upon the ground. The wicked wife is, of course, sought at once and the ring procured. When it has been placed upon the paw of the wolf, the witnesses see a wolf no longer, but the man restored to his humanity.

In this third division—of involuntary werwolves—must be placed our werwolf, Alphouns, who, though apparently made werwolf by magic salves only, no ring being mentioned, is restored to human form through a combination of ring and necklace.

A noymment anon sche made: of so grete strengþe  
 bi enchaunmens of charmes: þat euil chaunche hire tide,  
 þat whan þat womman per-wijt: hadde þat worpi child  
 ones wel an-oynted þe child: wel al a-bowte  
 he wex to a werwolf wíztly þer-after  
 al þe making of man so mysse hadde ȝhe schaped.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Earliest known edition, Basel, 1602; quoted by REINHOLD KÖHLER in the Introduction to the "Lais de Marie de France," *Bibliotheca Normannica*, Vol. III, pp. lxxix, lxxx.

<sup>2</sup> *William of Palerne*, E. E. T. S. Ex. Ser., I, ll. 136-41.

But at the last, when compelled to redress the wrong she had committed:

pan rauzt sche forþ a ring: a rich and a nobul.  
 þe ston pat þeron was stijt was of so stif vertu  
 pat neuer man upon mold: mist it him on haue  
 ne schuld he with wiccheecraft be wicched neuer-more.  
 \* \* \* \* \*

pat riche ring ful redily with a red silk þrede  
 þe quen bond als bliue a-boute þe wolwes necke.  
 seþe feiþli of a forcer a fair bok sche rauzt.  
 & radde þeron redli riȝt a long while  
 so pat sche made him to man,<sup>1</sup>

a naked man, as almost all werwolves seem to become when freed from the wolf-nature.

Of course, there are endless combinations of these types with each other and with other methods of magic, as shown by the salve and the magic book in *William*. All probably represent some confusion or combination of stories, and all are comparatively late. Even the story of Sigmund and Sinfjötli, one of the earliest of the Teutonic tales of werwolves that have come down to us, may be a combination of Types II and III, since it is expressly stated that the men who lay asleep with the wolf-shirts hanging above them had "great gold rings" on their fingers. Again, we have a combination of Type I, the constitutional werwolf, with the ring type, III, in the *Lai de Mélion*, where the hero removes his clothes, but must also be touched with his magic ring before he can assume werwolf shape, and touched with it again before he can return to human form.<sup>2</sup>

It was in trying to fix the position of Alphouns among his werwolf brethren that I was led to make the foregoing distinctions, with the results that shall be summed up later on. Having settled the predominating types of werwolves, in the three chief divisions that I have described and illustrated, I was struck with the fact (hinted by Mr. Kirby Smith in a general statement that the Scandinavians worked out a complete theory of transforma-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, ll. 4424-34.

<sup>2</sup> See Introduction by R. KÖHLER to "Lais de Marie de France—*Bisclavret*," *Bibliotheca Normannica*, Vol. III, pp. lxxvi-lxxviii.

tions—but not in any way developed or illustrated by him) that the swan-transformation stories and legends, which, in various forms, are interwoven in the romances of the Middle Ages, would fall into exactly parallel classes—even including that first class which Mr. Kirby Smith makes *sui generis* and quite unparalleled in literature or legend.

Under the first method of transformation come the stories recorded by Grimm that represent the folk-tales corresponding to the "Schwann-Ritter Saga." In these the children who have become swans must put on *shirts* to become human children again. The mere throwing of the human garments about them transforms them at once to human shape. The detail that, in most cases, the shirts are required to be of a special sort, made after a magic formula—as in the story where the small sister must weave the shirts of nettles gathered by night in a churchyard, and must neither speak nor laugh during the seven years of the weaving—all this is mere late addition of folk-magic, designed to heighten the effect of the tale.<sup>1</sup>

In the second category fall the legends of the swan maidens, the valkyrie, who for the sake of speed assume the swan-mantles for which they are specially distinguished. One of the most charming of the stories about them is that into which Wayland has also been introduced.<sup>2</sup> Wayland, following a hind that appears suddenly before him, is led to a fountain in the midst of the forest. Presently to this fountain come three swans (another version says three doves), who transform themselves into beautiful women by the removal of their swan-mantles, or clothes, and, leaving these on shore, step into the fountain to bathe. Wayland possesses himself of their garments, and so has the maidens in his power. In the one story he lets two of the swans escape, keeping the third for his wife; in the other, the "Volundarkviða," where he is joined by his two brothers, each takes one and forces her to marry him. The point of the story lies in the fact that the

<sup>1</sup> See BRÜDER GRIMM, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (Berlin, 1870), Tale 49, p. 191. Compare HANS ANDERSEN, "The White Swans;" also GRIMM, Tale 9, p. 37, "Die zwölf Brüder"—a similar story.

<sup>2</sup> See "Friedrich von Schwaben" and "Volundarkviða," quoted by SCHOFIELD, "The Lays of Graelent and Lanval," *Publications of Modern Language Association*, New Series, Vol. VIII (1900), pp. 134, 135.

moment the swan-mantles are removed their owners become human, and they cannot possibly resume their bird-forms without regaining and assuming the mantles.

In one of the swan-boy legends, also, the boys return to their swan-shapes by means of swan-shirts which they have removed to become human. In this case, since the boys are enchanted, they can remove their feather-clothing only at fixed intervals—during the night—and are compelled to resume it, even against their wills, at daybreak.<sup>1</sup>

But the method of transformation that is most frequently used in the versions of the swan-knight story is that third method that depends upon the magic circle of gold, in this case represented by a necklace. The six little boys, all born at one time in the forest, excite the envy of the wicked queen, their grandmother, by the gold necklaces found upon their necks. When the necklaces are stolen from them, all become swans, and remain in that form until, years afterward, the necklaces are restored. The one little swan-boy whose necklace has been melted up, and the magic thus destroyed, never becomes human.<sup>2</sup> In one swan-maiden story also the maiden's necklace is mentioned, and though it is not directly connected with the transformation, in some older version it is altogether probable that it figured more prominently.

Perhaps the last-named story would stand best as a combined type, like some of the *Märchen* of the swan-children, where the boys, transformed by their wicked grandmother, can be brought back to their rightful shape only through the shirts woven by the little sister whose necklace is mentioned as her most precious possession. Since no adequate reason appears to explain why the little girl did not become a swan with her brothers, perhaps it is

<sup>1</sup> *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, Tale 49, p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> In English, *The Romance of the Chevalere Assigne*, ed. H. H. GIBBS, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 6, 1908; prose version, *Helyas Knight of the Swan*, printed by Robert Copland early in the sixteenth century, ed. THOMS, 1858. The earliest version of the story known to exist is in the Latin romance by the monk JEAN DE HAUTE SEILLE (JOHANNES DE ALTA SILVA), entitled *Dolopathos sive de Rege et Septem Sapientibus*, twelfth century, ed. OESTERLEY, 1873. There are several French versions, the first directly from *Dolopathos* by the poet HERBERT, twelfth century, "Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne," ed. in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. IV (1889); *Chanson du Chevalier au Cygne et de Godefroy de Bouillon* (so-called *Elie* version), ed. HIPPEAU (Paris, 1874), etc. Cf. WAGNER's *Lohengrin* for modern treatment of the story.

not too presumptuous to assume that here, as in the more elaborate romance versions of the story, the necklace proved an effective charm to keep its owner human.

We have seen, then, that both werwolf stories and swan stories—the best-known and most widespread examples of the human-animal transformation idea—may be grouped in three general classes. The first class accomplishes its transformation simply by the removal of human clothes, and by the resumption of these same clothes. A dual nature is presupposed. Ordinarily there is no fixed time at which the metamorphosis takes place. The change is usually voluntary. The man becomes wolf when and where he pleases, and returns to the human shape when his wolf-passions are appeased. The swan-boys, on the other hand, have been cursed with the swan-shape and cannot return to their true form at will. The wolf story, in this instance, is probably the more primitive. Definite time limits, such as are imposed in the “Lai de Bisclavret,” are probably a later addition also.<sup>1</sup>

The second class comprises the transformations by means of the skins of animal or bird—when the skins assumed are removed their wearers return to human shape. The change may be voluntary or involuntary; forced upon the man by a curse, or assumed at his own discretion and for a special purpose. The human nature here is uppermost, as is the animal nature in the first class, the power to transform it lying, as before, in the clothes assumed. Here the change is more frequently periodic than not, as we saw in the case of the swan-children who were boys by night, swans by day, and in that of the *Sigmund* story, where the periods were nine days long.

Lastly, the third class covers all those legends in which voluntary—or involuntary—change to wolf or swan is caused by the use of a magic circle of gold—ring or necklace—with or without accompanying charms.

What, now, is the relative age of these three classes of transformations? Undoubtedly, Class I, in its *oldest* form a purely voluntary constitutional type,<sup>2</sup> in which only the removal and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. KIRBY SMITH.

<sup>2</sup> In many versions coming under this type the change is due to a curse, inherited or incurred by the man himself, and so is *involuntary*, occurring periodically at definite inter-

resumption of human clothes are necessary to accomplish the change of shape, is the most ancient.<sup>1</sup> For, in the first place, it is the simplest in device, thus agreeing with the principle that, the farther back we go, the simpler do beliefs and legends become; the older they are, the less are they burdened with detail. Again, it shows a primitive belief in the weakness of the division between man and the lower animals, and in the ease with which the line may be crossed by one and the other. Finally, it is not only the simplest, but the most perfect expression of the underlying idea, in at least all the werewolf transformation stories, of the duality existing in the very nature of the man-wolf; that duality which, more than all his acts of ferocity while in the wolf-form, has rendered him an object of hatred and grisly horror from the oldest times until now.

The relative ages of the second and third types are harder to determine. The magic-circle type is not necessarily the latest. For this idea of a magic circle is very ancient. Possibly this, once a general formula for changes of all kinds, may have come to be used for changes in form and nature between man and animals as early as the use of the actual skins of animals—or earlier. On the face of it, however, the use of the skins of the birds or animals themselves appears more primitive. It is a case of the appearance making the man: as, in the first type, one puts on human clothes to become human, so, in the second, one puts on animal clothes, and with them the nature and attributes represented by them in the popular imagination. As Mr. Kirby Smith says:<sup>2</sup> "The reasoning is simple and clear to the primitive mind—put on the wolf-shape, you become wolf." In the same way, assume the feathers of a swan, you are swan—with, of course, traces of the original nature remaining. A later age, with its more sophisticated ideas of magic, finds insufficient causation in the old stories, and the most widely used instrument of its magic, the *ring*, is introduced as a result.

vals of time. But in the *most ancient* form of the legend the change would seem to have depended on the man's own will, and so may be classed as purely voluntary. Cf. KIRBY SMITH, as before.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. KIRBY SMITH, "The Werwolf," pp. 39, 40.

<sup>2</sup> "The Werwolf," p. 40.



The primitive form of the werwolf stories which group themselves in classes I and II, as compared with that of those in Class III, corroborates the belief in the comparative lateness of the latter. Moreover, in the case of the swan-series, we find the *Marchen* and folk-tales going into Classes I and II with, if anything, only a trace of the ring idea; while the romances, in all cases less primitive, group themselves in Class III.

The werwolf story embodied in *William of Palerne*, therefore, falls into what is probably the least primitive class of transformations, and its nearest parallel is found in the romance of the swan-knights. The fact that the ring, in Alphouns's case, is not used as a ring upon the finger, but is suspended by a cord about his neck, makes him the more nearly akin to the knights whose necklaces were necessary to their lives as men. Their stories in general, too, are similar. Like them, he suffered from the wrath of a witch in his father's household; like them, he wandered far and wide in his transformed shape; like them, he performed services of kindness wherever he went; and, like them, was finally restored to humanity through the golden circle. Though inhabiting a form which carried with it suggestions of wickedness and horror beyond expression, he seems to me fully worthy to stand in our affections side by side with those darlings of romance.

KATE WATKINS TIBBALS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

NOTE.—A transformation analogous to a combination of Classes I and II of the werwolf transformations has been pointed out to me by Professor F. I. Carpenter in STRAPAROLA's *Nights* (English edition, Vol. I, pp. 53-64). The story is as follows: Galeotto, king of Anglia, had a very beautiful wife named Ersilia. Their union was perfect but for one thing—the lack of children. One day Ersilia fell asleep in the forest, and while she slept three fairies came and blessed her. One said she should never fear, and should have a son. The second endowed this son with great gifts of mind and character. The third said he should be born in the shape of a pig, and should retain that form until he had thrice wedded a beautiful maiden.

In process of time the prince was born. Great was the horror of king and queen when they beheld his shape. His mother loved him, however, and he was allowed to run at will over the palace, even after wallowing in the mud of the street. One human gift he possessed—that of speech.

When the pig-prince had attained to years of manhood, he came one day to his mother and demanded a wife; and so violent did he become, when his request was refused, that the king and queen were forced to consider some means of agreeing to his demand.

There was a poor widow in the country who had three beautiful daughters. Her they summoned and asked the eldest of the girls for their son. Reluctantly the mother consented. The daughter was brought to the palace and wedded to the pig-prince. But at

night, when she saw him come in covered with mud, she plotted with herself how to kill him. He heard her whispered words, and rushing upon her slew her in her bed.

Some time after he again demanded a wife. The widow's second daughter, who had married him, like her older sister, in the hope of murdering him and succeeding to his wealth, met with the first wife's fate.

Once more Prince Pig demanded a spouse, and this time so violently that the queen went trembling to the widow to beg the hand of her third and youngest daughter for her terrible son. Gladly and humbly the young girl consented. With great gentleness and show of affection she called the prince to her and bade him lie on a fold of her gorgeous bridal gown. With patience she awaited his return at night, and lovingly summoned him to her side. What was her astonishment to see him strip off the loathsome hide of the pig and stand before her a radiantly beautiful naked prince. By day he continued for some time to assume the pigskin, by night his human form. At last, however, he was freed from the charm, and king, queen, and people rejoiced in his release.

Here we see indicated several characteristic points of the general transformation formula: (1) The prince possesses the dual nature, for while he retains the swine-shape he has the swinish desires of wallowing and gluttony. (2) He has certain murderous instincts which ally him with the werwolves, though in this instance justified as self-defense. (3) After his marriage with the youngest daughter he can assume or remove the skin at will—a trait of the transformations under Type II. (4) His animal shape is the result of a curse laid upon his mother previous to his birth—a common circumstance among the stories under Type I. On the whole, his is a combination of Types I and II.

The gift of speech is not generally granted to transformed men while in their animal or bird shapes; e. g., Alphouns communicates with William and Melior only by signs, the Jewish wolf by writing.

No doubt many other sporadic examples of transformation into the shapes of various animals could be adduced. Those given above, however, seem sufficient to establish the theory of three distinct yet interconnected types, under which may be grouped parallel stories at least from the swan and werwolf series of legends.



## PRIMITIVE POETRY AND THE BALLAD.

### III.

THE dualism of communal and individual poetry, and the formula of distinction between cumulative impression in an appeal to emotional community and provocative, imaginative appeal to individual sentiment, rest on the assumption that such changes as have come about in the conditions under which poetry is made have affected the whole poetic process, composition and record alike, changing both the poetic quality and the poetic appeal. The changes in environment are sociological and ethnological facts for which evidence is plentiful, and which led M. Brunetière<sup>1</sup> to invoke that "croissante complexité de la vie sociale" as cause of the modern personal notes in poetry. The changes of quality and appeal are literary facts open to the estimate of every critic. Professor Brandl remarks, in the essay already quoted, that I ought to have been jested out of my *sancta simplicitas* as a disciple of Jacob Grimm; I could wish that Professor Brandl were to be persuaded out of his hilarity into a look at the facts. When Mr. Seebohm, in his new book<sup>2</sup> as in his old, ranges the facts to show that older stages of social development must have cherished communal ownership and must have greatly restricted individual rights, one does not answer him with an obituary notice of the late Mr. Buckle. Again, within the range of facts, only those are to be considered here which bear directly on the case in hand. I protest against any implication of other critical views as fatal to the communal claim. Suppose, to quote from Professor Gildersleeve's "brief" but delightful "mention" of Bréal's essay, suppose that the Homeric poems were made, like modern opera, for a fashionable audience, and are sophisticated to a degree. Suppose the main thing in Homer to be the individual appeal, the cosmic thinking, the sentiment; suppose that the communal epic

<sup>1</sup> *Questions de critique*, "La littérature personnelle," p. 236, first published in 1888.

<sup>2</sup> *Tribal Customs in Anglo-Saxon Law* (1902), cf. pp. 496 ff.

majesty, the cumulative appeal, asserted in the foregoing section of this paper, are not to be found in Homer at all. Suppose his rich imagery takes him out of the communal file altogether, and suppose the *Nibelungen* itself to have no trace of the really popular strain.<sup>1</sup> Or, again, suppose this Homer was the wandering minstrel lately described with such charm by M. Anatole France. Or suppose ballads with F. A. Wolf; suppose *gemeinsames dichten* with Lachmann; suppose with the accretion folk; suppose a nation in verse with Grimm; suppose celestial origins with that reverent and tiptoe critic of the *Nation*; suppose what one will, or—*nam non curatur qui curat*—suppose nothing serious whatever, as Mr. Gregory Smith seems to recommend in the case of ballads: from none of these suppositions about the epic can come any real conclusion about the argument now before us. To prove that Homer is not primitive does not touch the validity of a formula based on known facts of actual primitive poetry. It must be proved by direct literary facts that ballads are not a survival of the old communal verse, of the primitive habit of poetic composition; it must be proved by sociological facts that the conditions of primitive verse-making were not essentially different from those of the modern poem. For such proof, I think, one will wait in vain. Sociological facts of merely modern range, without historical perspective, can say little for the matter; and as little can be said by pretty “laws” of social life, unless they really cover all the ground which they claim. It is a neat summary and phrase of M. Tarde when he says<sup>2</sup> that “il n’y a pas de science de l’individuel, mais il n’y a d’art que de l’individuel.” Yet no one knows better than M. Tarde, with his clever illustration of the juryman, that an individual thinking and acting for himself is another person from the same individual feeling and acting with a crowd. Nor again, for confuting the theory of poetic dualism and destroying the formula of distinction, will it do to appeal to ultimate unity. In the last analysis poetry is one and the same at all times and places. If poetry of the throng is dominated by oral tradition, so the poetry of solitude is compassed about by its own cloud of

<sup>1</sup> EUGEN WOLFF, “Über den Stil des Nibelungenliedes,” in *Verhandlungen der 40sten Versammlung deutscher Philologen*, etc. (Leipzig, 1890), cf. pp. 262 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Les lois sociales* (1898), p. 155.

silent but determining forces; literary heredity is there, literary environment is there; and every poem must be at heart a mysterious blending of individual with social elements. But conditions of production determine the product in its characteristics; these are sufficient for dualism and formula; and with these, as plain facts, one has to deal.<sup>1</sup>

The product, however, is in itself a plain fact; and to the plain facts of ballad literature recent writers have been devoting their attention untroubled by questions of a comparative and of a sociological drift. Two,<sup>2</sup> whose intimate knowledge of Scottish vernacular literature gives them an advantage in the discussion, have looked at the ballad for itself; their conclusion not only rejects the communal claim of origins, but makes, if successful, for a destruction far wider and far deeper in its reach. In his earlier book<sup>3</sup> Mr. Henderson depends mainly on humorous remarks about "the really tends, he says, to obscure and finally to efface the ballad. A reviewer,<sup>4</sup> with style and comment astonishingly like the style and comment of Mr. Andrew Lang, disposes of this argument with the remark that "Mr. Henderson shows no sign of knowing anything about the matter;" and, while these are indeed bitter words, I must agree with them, if only for the reason that a writer who discusses the ballad with-

<sup>1</sup>Folk-song, a far wider field than that of the traditional ballad, complicates the problem, but must be met in any final argument on this communal theme. Two interesting papers, one by JOHN MEYER, "Volkslied und Kunstlied in Deutschland," in the *Beilage zur allgem. Zeitung*, Munich, March, 1898, Nos. 53, 54, and one by DR. P. S. ALLEN, on "W. Müller and the German Volkslied," in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Vol. II, pp. 283 ff., assert the contemporary doctrine that a folk-song is and was merely something sung by the folk. See also an article on "Cafés-concerts et Music Halls," *Revue des deux Mondes*, July, 1902, p. 61; "le café-concert est devenu l'art du peuple;" each man sings his couplet, it would seem, as the Norwegian peasant sang his *stev* or the Italian his *strambotto*. With such dissent as the upholder of communal theory finds in these articles there are two ways to deal. One is to deny outright any real analogy between the popular song of today, whether rural or of the *café-concert*, and the ballads and songs once produced by homogeneous communities and handed down by oral tradition. The task here is to prove the homogeneous conditions, once real, to be now no longer in existence, and also to prove the necessary connection of these conditions with communal poetry. Or one may reply that the ballad and the folk-song of tradition are simply higher and better specimens of a degenerating art which with these "crazy couplets in a tavern hall" has reached almost the lowest step in its melancholy *dégringolade*. For what follows I shall only ask the reader to keep always in mind the absolute difference between stages in chronology and stages in evolution.

<sup>2</sup>MR. GREGORY SMITH, in his *Transition Period*, 1900, handling the European ballad of the fifteenth century, and MR. HENDERSON, first in his *Scottish Vernacular Literature*, 1898, and now in this edition of the *Minstrelsy*.

<sup>3</sup>Chap. xi.

<sup>4</sup>*Daily News*, January 4, 1899.

out looking at its elements and characteristics, without answering claims about the conditions under which it arose, deserves no serious consideration. Very different is the case in Mr. Henderson's edition of the *Minstrelsy*. He deals there with a definite group of ballads, briefly in his introduction, but mainly in his comment on individual poems. The drift of this critical work is very plain. Not only does proof of recent manufacture and of wholesale contamination seem to reduce communal theories to a pious but absurd superstition; it is really an attack upon balladry as a whole. It tends to break down, once for all, what so many other critics assail in these latter days—that worship of the ballad as a thing apart, as flotsam and jetsam from a sunken Atlantis of poetry.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Henderson, except for a few introductory opinions, does not argue the case; he examines the specimens of his collection and politely points out amiable but misguided enthusiasms of the former owner. "You see," he seems to say, "Sir Walter's labels? Of course, he had the best intentions. . . . Strange, though, that Professor Child, indeed an industrious and sagacious man, should have copied so many of these tags." Flaws, defects, mistakes of date and locality, are pointed out; but this zeal is not meant merely to correct the record. In the museum at Oxford, I think it is, one sees a number of genuine old flint arrow-heads, knives, and the like; close beside these are the counterfeits, and a photograph of the wily peasant who made them. Mr. Henderson goes farther than this. Scott, as everyone knows, put some innocent and acknowledged counterfeits into his collection—imitations made by himself, by Leyden, Sharpe, and others; they do no harm and have never disturbed the student of popular song. Now, Mr. Henderson will not utterly and at once deny the distinction; but he does imply that from imitating to editing and patching is no wide leap, and he evidently believes that the constantly growing mass of excisions from traditional material—excisions due now to discovered forgeries and now to innocent

<sup>1</sup> Appreciation of poetical qualities in the ballad is not our present concern; but I am inclined to think the reader will back what MR. CHILD says (Vol. II, p. 238) of *The Wife of Usher's Well*: "Nothing that we have is more profoundly affecting," against MR. HENDERSON's remark (Vol. III, p. 320): "There is nothing remarkable in the story, which might well be the creation of a dream." To Mr. Child's praise of "Edward," MR. HENDERSON (*Scot. Ver. Lit.*, p. 338), drily remarks that the thing has been "doctored."



misunderstandings, innocent restoration, correction, arrangement—must in time reduce the ballad of tradition to quite negligible quality and quantity. He gives to Burns, for example, a share in that fine “old” ballad of “Tam Lane,” which he suspects to have come from a romance, and to Scott practically all of “Kinmont Willie,” as we knew, and of “Katharine Janfarie.”<sup>1</sup> But we are not troubled over these random losses; like King Hal,

We do not mean the coursing snatchers only,  
But fear the main intendment of the Scot.

Ballads, he declares, grow worse by tradition—a statement quite true for the circumstances to which he confines his research.<sup>2</sup> Could one come at all the facts, so he seems to argue, one would find popular poetry to be a patchwork of silk and frieze—silk both contributed from the private store of a Burns and begged as scraps from the discarded gowns of romance; frieze from the uncouth and vulgar haunts of the wandering minstrel, the sturdy beggar, the act-of-Parliament rogue.

This argument, however, is going to prove, if it is valid, a vast deal more than one might think, and will pull down a huge critical edifice heretofore regarded as solid and firm. It is not an argument; it is a revolution. Down go the gates of authentic balladry. Tom Deloney, Anthony Now-Now, and all that rout, are free of the city. Down go the barriers between a traditional ballad and doggerel of the stall. If one find this excellent ballad, give it to an excellent but anonymous poet. If chivalry and the large air of deeds commend that ballad of battles long ago, consider it a fragment of old polite romance flung to the chances of popular and oral record.<sup>3</sup> More than this, it seems that no test is left, that I can discover, by which one may pass upon the claims of a ballad to its place in any collection. Spirit, purpose, and meaning disappear, for such criticism, from the great work of Professor Child. “This Ninth Part,” he wrote in 1894,

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II, pp. 380, 387.

<sup>2</sup> As far back as 1809, in the *Mémoires de l'Académie celtique*, p. 288, “Notice du Patois Vendéen,” M. REVILLIÈRE-LEPEAUX noted that it was the bad songs that got into print, while the best were to be sought in oral tradition.

<sup>3</sup> For considerations which seem to make impossible this theory of Scott himself, of Professor Courthope, Mr. Henderson, and others, see the writer's *Beginnings of Poetry*, pp. 179 ff.

"completes the collection of English and Scottish ballads to the extent of my knowledge of sources"—with the exception of one uncopied piece in a lost manuscript. But how "complete"? It is clear that the notion of a traditional ballad existed in very exact shape for Professor Child, when one thinks of the host which he rejected. In Johnson's *Cyclopædia* he made a provisional statement of this notion; but it was not final, and he wished it to be neither quoted nor regarded as final. The statement is both negative and positive. With his sturdy common-sense, Mr. Child balked at the idea of folk-made poetry as set forth by Wilhelm Grimm; with sturdy particular sense, however, gained from long commerce with his subject, he goes on to say that, although men and not communities make the ballad, it comes from a period when people are not divided into markedly distinct classes, when "there is such community of ideas and feelings that the whole people form an individual." It must be traditional, then, and sprung from that homogeneous, unlettered community which all the great writers on balladry, including Ferdinand Wolf, himself a resolute skeptic about communal authorship, have demanded as a necessary condition of the original ballad. But this positive part of the statement Mr. Henderson rejects as highly inconvenient for his own view of the case; if Professor Child had put his mind on the subject, so a note<sup>1</sup> of expostulation declares, he would have come to a sounder and saner judgment. He would not, one may so interpret Mr. Henderson, any longer call the ballad "a distinct and very important species of poetry." He would not call fifteenth-century ballads "the creation . . . of the whole people, great and humble, who were still one in all essentials." He would not say that later ballads "belong to a different genus; they are products of a low kind of *art*."<sup>2</sup> In other words, he would have come to negation absolute, and could have given no final reason for the inclusions and exclusions of his own collection—itsself a definition of balladry—save a kind of consistent caprice.<sup>3</sup> That most scientific and comprehensive effort to gather what the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. I, p. xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Child's italics. See the whole article.

<sup>3</sup> In his *Scottish Vernacular Literature*, p. 336, MR. HENDERSON speaks kindly but firmly of this collection: "The chaff is out of all proportion to the wheat." How does Mr. Henderson test the wheat?

editor thought to be a definite class of poems, a class no longer represented in contemporary verse and therefore inviting a balance of the account, becomes a sort of glorified commonplace-book to be regarded, *mutatis mutandis*, somewhat as one regards Ben Jonson's *Timber*. The ballad, as a literary species, is thus read out of existence; and, as in the case of folk-songs, nothing is left to it in the way of definition save the vague predicate of "popular." Mr. Child simply collected the things which he liked out of a mass of things which seem to have been liked by the people.<sup>1</sup>

Such is the implication of Mr. Henderson's remarks on the ballads which he has edited, for the narrower case, with taste, knowledge, and skill. But what he does not say is said out loud and bold by Mr. Gregory Smith,<sup>2</sup> who speaks from his critical watch-tower overlooking all the literature of the fifteenth century. What are these ballads, then? Popular? Not in the slightest. They are "a literary<sup>3</sup> survival or *réchauffé* . . . of certain pre-existing literary forms;" they are "literary products." In Italy, "*rispetti* and *stornelli* were written for the people." The epic is not a resultant of ballads;<sup>4</sup> and ballads themselves, far from being "popular," far even from being the work of minstrels, are a literary venture from the start, and a late venture at that. Mr. Smith does not go outside of Europe and the fifteenth century for his facts, and he pays no heed to argument or authority. He gives a polite nod to the late Gaston Paris, and then ruthlessly rides him down. Such communal elements as refrain, repetition, lack of trope or figure; such sociological facts as the power of improvisation once universal with the peasants of Europe; such ethno-

<sup>1</sup>No one can say what would have been Mr. Child's final word on this matter. Some notes for his general introduction which he showed me—I think in the summer of 1883—were scanty and tentative, mainly references to early English and other sources where ballads are either mentioned or implied. There is rich reward, however, for anyone who will excerpt all his critical remarks and determine their general drift. What, for example, are the qualities which make Mr. Child say of "Johnie Cock" that it is "a precious specimen of the unspoiled traditional ballad" (Vol. III, p. 1)?

<sup>2</sup>*Transition Period*, pp. 181-235.

<sup>3</sup>Mr. Smith's own italics.

<sup>4</sup>That is, I suppose, the *Gest of Robin Hood* was not "put together as early as 1400 or before" (CHILD) on the basis of older ballads; the ballads were broken up from it or from an older form of it. When SLOTH in *Piers Plowman* refers to "rymes of Robin Hood," he doubtless means the epic, a copy of which he carries with him! But MR. SMITH calls the *gest* "a conglomerate of the ballad episodes," and says "the seemingly 'popular' character of these ballads requires some explanation." I agree with Mr. Smith here; but vehemently protest against Robin as an avatar of King Arthur.

logical facts as the growth of ballad-like songs in lower stages of culture; such cases as the Bannockburn songs, the Faroe islanders' ballad, the dancing and singing women of mediæval fame who made ballads upon persons and things as they danced; the survivals of communal song gathered by folk-lore from field and farm—for these and kindred facts Mr. Smith has no care. A specimen of his attempt at serious argument to show that men like Villon and Dunbar wrote what we call popular ballads is his use of the word *ballate*<sup>1</sup>—a word then applied, if Mr. Smith but knew it, to anything from sensational journalism up to the Song of Solomon in an early version of the English Bible. Nobody could possibly go farther in the rejection of ballads as a class than Mr. Smith goes in these brief and light-hearted remarks, flung out, he says, not to convince the seeker after truth, but “simply to add to the gaiety of the ballad symposium.” That is all very well for the common-room after dinner; as a printed contribution to what professes to be the historical study of literature, purpose and performance will be weighed in the scholar's balance and found wanting. Something more is needed to do what this argument essays to do, and bring the critical world back to that aristocratic disdain for all poetry of the people which held sway until the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Better, wider, deeper thinking must be spent upon this subject, if Herder and the Grimms and Wolf, pioneers, are to have all the hard-won territory taken from them, if colonists like Percy of old, Grundtvig and Child of later days, are to be proved aliens without right to the soil, their planting and reaping all in vain. Mr. Smith's arguments and theory have done no harm. Danger lies in direct attacks upon the ballads themselves. Admit what is hinted by Mr. Henderson, run every ballad to earth in a poet's yard, and the ballad itself is a figment of theory, a missing link. Mr. Henderson may say, indeed, that he is simply editing the *Minstrelsy*, and telling the whole truth about it so far as his information goes; he is not trying to read the ballad out of existence. But he must take the consequences of his general statements and of his particular criticism. Both statement and criticism suffer,

<sup>1</sup> ee pp. 184, 195.

as Mr. Smith's theory not only suffers but dies, from the fact that the conclusions are very wide and the range of material very narrow. Mr. Child's keen instinct for a ballad of tradition was backed by intimate acquaintance with the balladry of all Europe. Mr. Henderson is like the physician who has never walked a hospital—sharp enough in his perceptions, conscientious, accurate, patient; but these qualities are not enough for diagnosis. Lack of experience leads him into particular error. "That *Willie's Ladye*," he says,<sup>1</sup> "is a genuine antique is not self-evident. It is not in the usual ballad measure." Had he only looked at the first volume of Child's collection, not to speak of Scandinavian and other ballads, he would not have made such a remark, no matter whether he held with Rosenberg that this old couplet added to the older refrain is source of ballad quatrains, or whether he took refuge in the septenar.

Two things the defender of communal origins in the ballad has a right to claim. First he asks that all the material be considered; and secondly he demands reasonable restitution of those communal elements—as he chooses to call them—which editors have very naturally omitted from the record. "Johnie Cock," which Mr. Child welcomed as a "precious specimen of the unspoiled traditional ballad," has a pervasive burden or refrain in the oldest copy, which was procured in 1780 by a lady of Carlisle. Marks of an even more pervasive tendency to repetition are also on this version. Scott's "Johnie of Breadislee," however, the same ballad made up from different copies, omits the refrain, touches away here and there the vain repetitions, and, making it more readable, leaves in it little traditional echo of the singing throng. It is evident, then, that an argument based on communal elements in the ballad needs to go outside of the *Minstrelsy* for material; and an answer to such argument must also come upon open ground. Plainly, too, in defending the test of a genuine ballad as traditional and ultimately derived from the remote time and place of homogeneous communities, collections like Child's and Grundtrig's, which assume such an origin, along with constant use of related literature, are indispensable material. Nevertheless, I shall take the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. III, p. 214.

*Minstrelsy* as it stands, and I shall ask whether Mr. Henderson's critical estimate of its contents must not yield to the communal claim that the ballads in it refuse to be classed with merely "popular" poems of art, but rather agree with the test of cumulative appeal to emotional community. It is not easy, in this sort of argument, to keep one's feet on firm ground. Refrains are refrains; repetition is repetition; the Faroe islanders, in their communal dance, singing an improvised ballad about an event hardly finished before their eyes, and with the hero in full view, present a stubborn fact; and I have noticed that the rationalists avoid discussion of such facts. But "cumulative appeal" and "emotional community" are fine food for rational powder. These qualities, so the taunt may run, exist in all poetry, have existed, will exist, like the other qualities of atomistic conception and imaginative appeal to individual sentiment. It is simply *naive und sentimentale dichtung* once more, under new names, to furbish up a shop-worn and unsalable theory.

It may be replied that cumulative appeal to emotional community is far more than *naive dichtung*; it is the vital principle of communal verse, and derives from the very elements which nobody really denies in that verse. If such an appeal is found in poetry of art, it is imitation, in whatever degree of success, of the communal quality. Scott, as I think, was the last of our poets who caught the note at its clearest and used it without effort; Tennyson, perhaps, carries his art as far as any in the opposite direction of individual appeal. In "Bonny Dundee," with its swinging refrain, where Scott revives the old charm far more successfully than in his direct imitations of the ballad, there is a stanza which at first sight seems analogous to a stanza of Tennyson's "Maud;" each is simple and direct in its appeal to emotion, and each employs a kind of natural magic in blending this appeal with a quality for which there is no better name than the picturesque:

He waved his proud hand, and the trumpets were blown,  
The kettle-drums clashed, and the horsemen rode on,  
Till on Ravelston's cliffs and on Clermiston's lee  
Died away the wild war-notes of Bonny Dundee. . . .

and Tennyson:

Alas for her that met me,  
That heard me softly call,  
Came glimmering through the laurels  
At the quiet evenfall,  
In the garden by the turrets  
Of the old manorial hall . . .

Critical analysis, however, soon puts these stanzas far apart, and traces back their distinct, and diverging paths of origin. Tennyson's simplicity and directness, suggestive withal, came by an exquisite art; Scott almost improvises. Tennyson's appeal is to individual sentiment; every word is a provocative whisper that sets the imagination peering down vista after vista of romance; every suggestion makes a kind of solitude for the reader's dream. Scott transports his hearer—not his reader, for the verse sings aloud—amid the clans and the bustle of march; he appeals, so far as the conditions of his art allow, to emotional community. Not a line, it is true, of "Bonny Dundee" could be foisted upon us for real ballad of tradition—perhaps that is the reason for its success in reproducing something of the communal spirit;<sup>1</sup> and yet it leads us back to the *Minstrelsy*, just as the *Minstrelsy* leads us to the balladry of Europe, and just as that holds in survival the elements of primitive song. In each of these backward steps one loses from view something more of the individual art without which, in however small degree, no deliberate effort of poetry can be rounded out and preserved. It is not a question of finding poetry where absolutely no individual art is concerned; one looks rather for poetry made under conditions which subordinated the individual to the community; and the ballads of the *Minstrelsy* are still in this class.

The first step from modern art back to communal conditions is made in passing from poetry written and read to poetry recited—or sung—and heard. Recited poetry can waken thought and

<sup>1</sup> The ballad "suggestion," however provocative and beautiful, is never akin to the beauty of the real ballad.

"She lingered by the Broken Brook,  
She drank of Weary Well,"

makes one think of ballads, but in doing so ceases to have the ballad appeal.



sentiment; but that is not its primary and prevailing appeal. The listener is rarely solitary; and what is now called an "audience" makes at once for emotional community, calling for cumulative impression, for repetition, and for progress by omitted details, qualities which are shunned by the art of written poetry, but which atone for their lack of suggestion by chances for gesture and emphasis in double working upon the eye and the ear. Now, these ballads of the *Minstrelsy* were handed down by recitation or song. Exceptions are unimportant. To trace this or that passage to a known and near source of composition, to expose Buchan's "wight of Homer's craft" as a kind of Mr. Jorkins, says nothing to the case; counterfeits prove the coin. If, then, these ballads, which Scott gathered with such care, show a measure of communal rather than individual traits, as they do, and if their appeal is to emotional community rather than to personal sentiment, is it not logical to attribute the presence of one set of qualities, the absence of another set, to the conditions under which these songs were made and then recited or sung? Is it not highly illogical to assume that an initial literary effort, the poetry that is written to be read, created the assumed communal qualities antecedent to the communal conditions? Such a supposition would be accepted in no other science than that of poetry. And what becomes of Mr. Smith's "*literary* survival or *réchauffé* . . . of certain pre-existing literary forms"? Warmed-up literary material might pass; but "warmed-up literary forms" is more than a hard saying. It defies common-sense and the facts in the case. Good stories wander everywhere. But the matter of a ballad, the tale it tells, is not the ballad. What "pre-existing literary forms," pray, are "warmed-up" in that pretty ballad<sup>1</sup> which is almost certainly the old tale of Hero and Leander passing through a hundred changes to its Westphalian version? Prince and princess pine for each other; deep waters intervene; love finds out the way; a *falske rune*, or witch, quenches the light; the prince is drowned, and the princess is broken-hearted. What follows has neither Antipater's conciseness nor Marlovian breadth; it takes the ballad way:

<sup>1</sup> REIFFERSCHIED, *Westfälische Volkslieder* (1879), p. 3.



"O Moder, sede se, Moder,  
min Ogen dot mi der so weh,  
mag ick der nich gahn spazeren  
an de Kant van de ruskende See?"

"O Dochter, sede de Moder,  
allene sallst du der nich gahn,  
weck up dinen jongsten Broder,  
un de sall mit di gahn."

"Min allerjungeste Broder,  
dat is so 'n unnüsel Kind,  
he schüt wol alle de Vüglkes  
de an der Seekante sind." . . .

Rebuff of this excuse follows, and then four exactly corresponding stanzas, with incremental repetition, about the youngest sister. The third of the series is decisive, of course, with a fine climax of the increment:

"O Moder, sede se, Moder,  
min *Herte* dot mi der so weh!  
lat annere gahn na de Kerken,  
ick *bet* an de ruskende See!"

Then the fisherman, and the body of the prince, and death. But the ballad is not in the tale; it is in the still small communal voice, in that cumulative appeal, that echo of communal emotion, it is in the singing<sup>1</sup> and in the hearing. And whence come these elements of the actual ballad, if not from the conditions under which poetry was made and sung in the unlettered homogeneous community? What pre-existing literary forms explain them? If Mr. Smith asks, as we all ask, why the older ballads are not preserved, why this "literary form" seems to spring up suddenly about the fifteenth century, we point to ample proof that popular ballads had existed but failed of record. Where, indeed, are the Anglo-Saxon ballads? *Urgentur longa nocte*, save for a faint glimpse of their matter in the chronicles of a William of Malmesbury. Art had not come to their rescue as actual poems. And why are fifteenth-century ballads handed down? First, because art did come to their rescue; secondly, because oral tradition of a given vernacular reaches back to those days,

<sup>1</sup> Professor E. H. Meyer, of Freiburg, told me that the motive of the third stanza of this ballad—where the *Rune* comes in—was worked into one of the great German symphonies.

and no farther. Finally, how does one know that the ballad, with these communal elements, really existed in early stages of poetic evolution? Because, by happy chance here and there, as with the Faroe case, one can see this early stage of the process and surprise a communal ballad in the making. More than this, one argues by analogy with the drama. Aristotle's account of the classical drama as developed out of chorus and communal improvisation rimes exactly with this theory of ballad origins. Carry Mr. Smith's or Mr. Henderson's theory to its logical conclusion, and it falls softly but surely into the bosom of Count de Maistre; primitive culture, beginnings of civilization amid savagery, are a myth of the sociologists, and barbarism is itself a *réchauffé* of pre-existing civilizations.

But Mr. Henderson calls us back to the material of the *Minstrelsy*. What are these ballads? Representations of the communal ballad, crossed by a deal of rude or polite art, along with considerable changes, additions, and arrangements of the editor. One will not find here a communal ballad, but one will find the communal ballad—entered, it is true, on its last stage as a living species of poetry. The late Professor ten Brink admirably defined old and vanished balladry as a making which “oscillated between production and reproduction.” Preserved only by a mingling of individual art, this old communal ballad begins with the smallest possible amount of production—one thinks, for matter, of the so-called cumulative songs; for style, of incremental repetition as developed out of refrains—to the greatest possible amount of reproduction; and gradually reverses this proportion, until the communal element has too little energy of its own, and too little aid from social conditions, to keep up its life. Then the ballad is dead. Now, the tradition which keeps this old ballad alive is at its best in popular memory; but it may also fall into professional hands. Then results what is called the minstrel ballad. Most of the historical ballads in Scott's *Minstrelsy* are of this class, and are often referred by Professor Child and others to the minstrel's actual making; perhaps a better phrase would be “minstrel's control.”<sup>1</sup> Here, of course, new subject-matter, new con-

<sup>1</sup> See the writer's *Old English Ballads*, pp. 311 ff.

ditions, and individual control reduce to a subordinate position those old elements of the ballad as a species. Refrains vanish; repetition is less insistent; recitation or individual chanting supersedes the song; and improvisation, if employed, has grown professional and almost thaumaturgic in purpose, the trick of a trade. Cumulative appeal, so far as iteration is concerned, becomes faint; whether the record fails to show what recitation allowed in this respect, one cannot say. Editors and printers abhor repetition. These orally transmitted chronicle ballads are taken down, but not until literary contamination has been at work; for the minstrel loves to pose as a rustic bard. Before print indeed, and before the general use of writing, the minstrel easily turned poet. Widsith, Deor, blind Bernlef, the poet of the *Heliand*, even Caedmon, are examples of this development. Under more modern conditions minstrels degenerate, lose caste, and fairly come upon the parish, like their wares; an interesting survival of this sort is furnished by the German bard of thirty years ago, who made a song<sup>1</sup> about Saarbrücken, and went on to sing every battle of the war along with his regular *mordgeschichten*. He fell on evil times, "Mordgeschichtenbesitzer Erb," and could have envied even the lot of his Scottish brethren a century ago. To these, indeed, we owe such a ballad as the "Rookhope Ryde."<sup>2</sup> "Composed," says Scott, "in 1596"—but certainly not in its present form—it was taken down by Ritson from the chanting of George Collingwood, a very old man. He died in 1785. Minstrelsy itself, not to speak of the ballad, is here in nearly its last stage. Of ballad elements one finds, besides barrenness of style, only the monotonous chant, and the occasional ghost of an old clan emotion as names of persons and places are droned out: "George Carrick and his brother Edie," the "Wear-dale men," "Harry Corbyl." The last stanza is that familiar minstrel tag, which has beguiled sundry scholars into a hasty inference about origins, but which, I am glad to say, even Mr. Gregory Smith<sup>3</sup> brushes aside as alien to the real ballad. There

<sup>1</sup> "Lied auf die Besetzung Saarbrückens durch die Franzosen." See CARL KÖHLER, *Zeitschr. für Volkskunde*, Vol. VIII (1896), pp. 223 ff.

<sup>2</sup> HENDERSON, Vol. II, pp. 130 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Transition Period*, pp. 229 f. On the "I" in ballads see *Beginnings of Poetry*, pp. 182 ff.

is no repetition, no lilt in the verse, no refrain; the minstrel has killed the ballad with clumsy kindness. Contrast the swing and the communal emotion, and the fine appeal of a ballad like "The Baron of Brackley"! In "Dick o' the Cow," another old ballad of this minstrel class, communal life is more astir; but they are all enfeebled offshoots of that old stock which, under far nobler graftings of art, grew into epic and finally into romance.

The next division of his collection, indeed, Scott calls by the name of Romantic. Here the old communal emotion, the old elements, are in a better case; that incipient art which has preserved them is in full sympathy with their original charm and appeal. It plays over the surface, and leaves almost intact the repetitions, the refrains, the ballad texture. Verging on the lyric, these ballads show a better symmetry and a smoother finish than one finds in the chronicle ballad, or, to be frank, than one could have found in the original communal song. Tradition, and that lyric quality which all popular use imposes upon such material, have sung them into their smoothness; but art has helped. "Sir Patrick Spens," communal in its structure, in its appeal, in its distinctively collective and impersonal emotion, has nevertheless in its form and finish suggestions of individual art. If Mr. Henderson wishes to say "doctored" of this ballad, of "Lord Randal" and the rest, as he does of "Edward," I shall not dispute about the word. The doctor in the case is not the parent. I think, however, that here is no real doctoring, but only the result of a change of air. In a wider emotional range such ballads lose their local awkwardness, their rusticity, and come closer to their lyric of art. Something of the artistic suggestion dear to individual lyric hovers about them, as it does also about those few but exquisite ballads of the supernatural like "The Wife of Usher's Well;" but this artistic suggestion is largely evoked from the modern reader, and is not a part of the old ballad appeal. The modern reader cannot escape his romantic and imaginative training. They have no personal sentiment in them, these ballads, no "lyric cry" of the modern type; they all lead back to the emotions of the throng and of the clan. Nowhere does one feel this communal quality so strongly as in the group of kin-tragedies,

such as "The Cruel Sister," a group very scantily represented in Scott's collection. "The Twa Brothers," "Child Maurice," even a half-spoiled traditional ballad like "Bewick and Graham," point unerringly back, not to the wrecks of romance, but to the beginnings of poetry in the singing and dancing throng.

Has not criticism of the ballad come at last to a point where it can break the deadlock of two hostile propositions, each in itself fortified by a confident appeal to facts and the ordinary sense of truth? Common-sense lies in the proposition that a distinct poem, a sequence of expressions in rhythmic form which tell a definite story or voice an intelligent thought, implies under modern conditions a distinct poet who has uttered them in that shape. Common-sense lies, too, in the proposition that there are elements in the ballad as a literary fact which cannot be explained by the modern conception of a poem. Certain masterpieces of the past are conceded by all critics to be impossible for modern poetry to reproduce, not because the particular creative genius of them does not happen to appear, but because the conditions under which they came to be have disappeared in the evolution of society and of art itself. There is no real opposition between the modern view and the historical estimate. We can cheerfully render unto that modern Caesar, the individual poet, all that poetry now implies. We should as cheerfully concede something to communal conditions of the past. In the present revolt against democracy of every sort, we are fain to exalt unduly the realm of individual power; and we are close upon the commission of a sort of scientific crime when we assert that no permanent result has been achieved for criticism by that great democratic impulse in literature which began about the middle of the eighteenth century, found its prophet in Herder, its teachers in F. A. Wolf, the Grimms, the Schlegels, Lachmann, and many another, which put forth its creed along with distinct achievements of investigation that have never been surpassed, which could boast in these latter days, and within the limits of modern philology, of such scholars as ten Brink, Child, Gaston Paris, and which now faces its end in mere derision. For a while, only particular teachings were attacked; the present move-

ment is against the whole spirit and significance of the democratic school. Surely in vain! Mistakes and extravagances beset the doctrine of the older school, and must be cleared away. The immaculate conception of poetry, the people that make an epic and the song that sings itself, are not defensible ideas. But the claim for communal poetry as a fact in the evolution of literature, a claim amply supported by the new sciences of sociology and ethnology, is a claim that can be defended, and will one day come to full recognition. In the foregoing pages I have tried to put the general claim in terms which are in accord with modern criticism as well as with modern science; and I have essayed within narrower lines to give a reasonable account of the relations which link the ballad to primitive and frankly communal poetry.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

## CARLYLE'S LIFE OF SCHILLER.

IN Kächler's exhaustive study on Carlyle and Schiller<sup>1</sup> the statement is made that, owing to the absence of the *London Magazine* (1823-24) in the principal libraries of Germany, the *Life of Friedrich Schiller*, as it appeared in book form (1825), could not be compared with the original form in the *London Magazine*.

Contrary to the assumption of Kächler, not only the appendix and some notes were added in 1825, but the text was modified and increased in more than one way. These changes may be of interest to close students of Carlyle, and hence the chief ones are herewith presented.

In regard to the text: Almost all of the translations in verse appeared for the first time when the *Life* was republished in book form.

From *Don Carlos* the *London Magazine* quotes only nine lines, beginning with:

Look round and view God's lordly universe.

In the sixth line of this quotation the wording was changed from "He leaves to will" to "He leaves Free-will," and in the last two lines from

The rustling of a leaf alarms King Philip,  
The Lord of Christendom must quake at every virtue,

to its present reading, which is closer to the German original.

From *Wallenstein* Carlyle inserted in the *London Magazine* only the short translations scattered through several pages of the text preceding the first long extract from *Piccolomini*, and substituted the very last quotation:

This kingly Wallenstein, whene'er he falls

for the following words: It is almost as if we viewed the ponderous  
swaying of some high majestic tower about to fall.

<sup>1</sup>Leipzig dissertation, 1902, p. 17. The second part of this study has just appeared in *Anglia*, Bd. XXVI, Heft 3.



Again, from *The Maid of Orleans* he quoted merely the two lines:

On the soil of France he sleeps, as does  
A hero on the shield he would not quit.

This rendering is somewhat better than the earlier translation in the *London Magazine*, which read:

On the soil of France in death reposes  
As a hero on the shield he would not quit.

The paragraph following this citation Carlyle added when he decided to insert the five scenes from the above-mentioned drama.

And lastly in discussing *Wilhelm Tell* he tells the story of the *apfelschufsszene* in the *London Magazine*, instead of giving it all in translation.

Besides these poetic extracts, four additions in prose were made: the introductory portion of Goethe's paper entitled "Happy Incident,"<sup>1</sup> in which the poet discusses his attitude toward Schiller (pp. 92-94);<sup>2</sup> the extracts from *Naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* and from the *Briefe über die aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen* (pp. 198, 199, 200-203); the long paragraph in which Carlyle pleads for Kant's philosophy as presented in Schiller's miscellaneous essays (pp. 112-14).

At least five notes were appended to the text in 1825: on p. 7, in which Carlyle quotes the curds-and-cream anecdote from Schiller's *Leben* (Heidelberg, 1817); on p. 25, where he speaks of the obnoxious passage in *The Robbers*, "Go to the Grisons," etc.; on p. 99, where he calls attention to Schiller's historical and philosophical essays; on p. 114, "Are our hopes from Mr. Coleridge always to be fruitless?" etc.; on p. 170, a quotation from Doering.

In addition to the alterations above mentioned, Carlyle substituted words and phrases at various places, and even, now and then, whole sentences. All these modifications would seem to indicate that the *Life of Schiller* when published in 1825 was not a reprint of the articles as they appeared in the *London Magazine*, but a carefully revised and enlarged biography.

FARGO, N. D.

MAX BATT.

<sup>1</sup> The paragraph immediately preceding this quotation as well as the following one are also wanting in the *London Magazine*. Such transitional passages were, of course, necessarily inserted in several places.

<sup>2</sup> Centenary edition of CARLYLE'S *Works*, Vol. XXV, 1890.

## OLD ENGLISH NOTES.

### I.

#### BEHŪDIGNES, "A DESERT."

IN Somner's *Dict. Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* (1659) and in Lye's *Dict. Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum* (1772) we find a *behydignys*, *desertum*, and thence the word with this meaning assigned to it found its way into all the later dictionaries, down to the most modern ones, in which it is generally brought into connection with *hȳdan*, "to hide." I think I can show that there is no real authority for a *behydignes*, "a desert," and also how the error arose. Somner gives the word and its meaning without any reference, but Lye adds *Ps.* 28, 7, and his source<sup>1</sup> as well as Somner's is evidently John Spelman's *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus*, which appeared in 1640, nineteen years before the publication of Somner's dictionary. Spelman's text (from a MS in his own possession, now MS Stowe in the British Museum) reads *Vox domini concutientis desertum*, the last word being glossed *westen*. On the margin he gives the variant *behydignys* from MS C (now MS Ff. i. 23 in the Cambridge University Library), and this of course led the dictionary makers to believe that in MS C the Latin word *desertum* occurred and was glossed by *behydignys*. But a reference to this MS shows that its Latin text does not read *desertum* (the Gallican reading), but *solitudinem* (the Roman reading). Thus a gloss *desertum*, *behydignes*, does not exist at all.

For completeness' sake it may be well to give the readings of all the MSS:

MS Vespasian A. 1 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *bihygdignisse*.

MS Junius 27 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *bihydignesne*.

MS Ff. i. 23. has *solitudinem*, glossed by *behydignys*.

MS Royal 2. B. 5 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *westen*.

The remaining six MSS (MS Stowe 2, MS Vitellius E. 18, MS Tiberius C. 6, MS Arundel 60, MS Salisbury 150, MS Lambeth 427) all read *desertum*, glossed by *westen*.

<sup>1</sup> Whether direct or through the medium of Junius's collections is immaterial.

It is obvious that the glosses in the first three MSS go back to one archetype, and also that it originated in the glossator's wrongly reading *solitudinem* as *solicitudinem*,<sup>1</sup> for that is the meaning of the word; compare my *Old English Glosses*, I, 5430, *sollicitudo*, *bihydines* (the Brussels MS has *bighydignys*), and I, 906, *sollicitudinis*, *bihydine* (MS Brussels *bihyd*). Compare also Matth. (Rushworth), 13, 22, *sollicitudo*, *behygdnis*, and the Vercelli MS fol. 90b, *Ac utoŋ we nu forþan ure sylfra lif mid mycle egesan and mid mycle behygdnesse geseon and sceawian ure sylfra lif and gearnian we mid godum dædum*, etc.

The further question arises: Should the word be written with the prefix *be-* or *bī-*? The majority of the instances given, with their *bi-* or *big-*, decidedly point to the latter, and this is confirmed by the spellings of the adjective and adverb in Bede, which I here cite according to page and line from Miller's edition:

P. 282, l. 29: *bighygdig* T, *byg-* B,<sup>2</sup> *bi-* O, *bi-* Ca.

P. 466, l. 26: *behydegæsta* T, *be-* B.

P. 66, l. 22: *bihygdlice* T, *big-* B, *be-* O, *be-* Ca.

P. 210, l. 32: *bighygdlice* T, *be-* B.

P. 336, l. 33: *bihygdlice* T, *big-* B, *bi-* O, *big-* Ca.

P. 380, l. 22: *bighydglice* T, *big-* B, *bi-* C, *big*, O, Ca.

The evidence is thus decidedly in favor of *bī-*.

## II.

### HLOSE, "A PIGSTY."

In a passage in the so-called *Gerefa* (*Anglia*, IX, 261) we read, among the various duties to be performed in autumn, "*fald weoxian, scipena behweorfan and hlosan eac swa*." Liebermann translates *hlosan* by "schutzdach bauen" with a query, and adds in a note: "falls aus *hleo* (obdach, schirm) gebildet. Oder vorgänger von *looze* (schweinestall) bei Halliwell?" This latter suggestion is undoubtedly right, and indeed the context points to the same conclusion; the *fald* is the "sheepfold," the *scipena* are the "shippons" (cowhouses), and as a third we should naturally expect the places for housing the pigs. That

<sup>1</sup> I see that SWEET in his *Oldest English Texts*, p. 573, has noticed the scribe's confusion of *solitudo* with *solicitudo* in the *Vespasian Psalter*.

<sup>2</sup> I give the variants of the prefix only.

the word really does mean "pigsty" is confirmed by its occurrence in a gloss (Wright-Walker, 204<sup>1</sup>): *Ceniluti* (read *ceniluti*, with Sievers, *Anglia*, XIII, 320) *swina hlose*. It is quite possible that the gloss has been assigned to a wrong lemma, or the glossator may have been thinking of the usual dirt in pigsties. The modern dialectal word *lewze* (pronounced *lūz*),<sup>1</sup> "a pigsty," is found in Somerset and Devon, and its present pronunciation points to an Old English long close *ō*.<sup>1</sup>

ARTHUR S. NAPIER.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,  
June, 1903.

### LANCE SUR FAUTRE.

SINCE the publication of my article on "Lance-sur fautre" in MODERN PHILOLOGY, October, 1903, a new passage has come to my knowledge, through the kindness of Professor T. A. Jenkins, which illustrates my theory better than any of those quoted before. It can be found in Foerster's edition of "Li chevaliers as deus espees," vss. 4675-83, and reads:

Parle orent en tel maniere  
Entr'els, puis se traient arriere  
Et ont les cheuaus adrecies,  
S'ont les escus auant sacies  
Et mueuent li uns contre l'autre,  
*Si metent les lances sus fautre*  
*Et de fautre sous les aissieles,*  
Andeus les missent en astieles  
Si tost comme il s'entrencontrerent.

I should also like to correct a misprint which occurred on p. 1 of my above-mentioned article. In l. 9 "Old English" should be replaced by "Old French."

A. C. VON NOÉ.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. WRIGHT (*Dial. Dict.*, III, 584), who suggests connection with *lew* "a shelter, etc.," Old Engl. *lēo*, but its occurrence in O. E. as *lōse* disproves that. Note that the development of O. E. *lēo* to the modern *lew* presupposes the same shifting of stress that we have in Modern English *lose* from O. E. *-lēosan*.



## MÜSPILLI.

THE origin and meaning of O.H.G. *mūspilli*, O.S. *mūdspellī*, *mūtspellī*, have been subjects for much discussion among Germanic scholars, and there has been no lack of theories. The explanations offered are widely different with respect to the former, but very similar with respect to the latter. For whatever the origin of the word may be, it is pretty generally agreed that it means some catastrophe closely connected with the end of the world or the end itself. I shall here cite the words of A. Olrik, whose discussion of the matter in his study of the Ragnarok myth<sup>1</sup> is one of the latest contributions to the subject; he has no doubt sifted all the evidence, but he accepts or offers no explanation for the origin of the word:

Concerning the real meaning of this word philologists have expressed widely different opinions; and neither in the German nor in the Northern sources does it seem that anyone has the slightest conception of its origin. But of its value as a word there reigns no doubt: *mūtspellī* means the same thing which otherwise in these poems is designated as the "day of retribution," "doomsday," "this light's (this world's) last day," "this world's end." More specifically it means the destruction of this world in its suddenness and in its terror. Since the world-fire belongs to the Christian doctrine concerning the destruction of the world, it is of course included, but *mūtspellī* is never directly connected with the fire.

If this be accepted as a fair statement summing up all that an impartial scholar may with safety say concerning the crux, the problem which still remains to be settled may perhaps be stated as follows: How is the compound *mūspilli* to be accounted for? What did it originally mean? Did its meaning change, and if so, how has it come to mean what it seems to mean, according to the opinion of Olrik and of other scholars? If its original meaning was

<sup>1</sup> "Om Ragnarok," *Aarbøger for nord. Oldkyndighed og Historie*, Vol. XVII (1902), 3. Hefte, p. 223. Cf. the following definitions of *mūspilli*: BRAUNE, *Ahd. Lesebuch*, "der weltuntergang, jüngste tag;" STEINMEYER, in M. und S., *Denkmäler*, Vol. II, p. 38, "weltbrand, weltuntergang durch feuer;" in the *Heliand* the meaning is, he says, "schon verblasst und abgeschwächt;" MÜLLENHOFF, *D.A.*, Vol. V, p. 66, "Das feuer das dereinst die welt zerstören wird hieß bei den Baiern im achten, neunten jahrhundert *mūspilli*, bei den Altsachsen *mūdspellī*;" HEYNE, *Heliand*, 281, "feuer des jüngsten tages, weltbrand;" BERAGHEL, *Heliand*, p. 214, "Weltuntergang;" PIPER, *Die alt. Bibeldichtung*, p. 207, "weltuntergang;" so also HOLTHAUSEN, *As. Elementarbuch*, p. 266.

the same as its meaning in the texts in which it has been preserved to us, we should have a comparatively simple (though not necessarily an easy) problem before us, namely, to ascertain the identity of each element of the word. If the original meaning has been lost, we should not only have to identify the two elements of the word, but also take into account complex, subtle, perhaps curious changes in meaning, in which misconceptions may not be excluded as possibilities. If the word be of heathen origin, there is a possibility that its use in the Christian poems *Hēliand* and *Mūspilli* may be "incorrect;" Christian poets may have misconstrued the word, because they may have had no conception of its origin, and if this be so, who shall say that one poet understood it in precisely the same way as another poet? If it be of Christian origin, the same possibility remains. A technical term based on some word or suggestion in Christian material dealing with the end of the world may not have had an absolutely fixed value, but may have had a considerable scope of meaning in the sphere to which it belonged. I think that one may grant the possibility that absolutely certain knowledge about the origin of the word need not necessarily bring with it a certain knowledge of what the authors of *Hēliand* and *Mūspilli* thought it meant, whether it was with them a general term embracing many catastrophes at the end of the world, or a special term for only one of them.

Having found, as I shall try to show, that the word is of Christian origin, I need hardly discuss at length the attempts that have been made to show that it is of heathen origin. Kögel<sup>1</sup> explains *mū-* in *mūspilli*, which he thus regards as the original form of the word, as identical with *mū-* in *mū-wurf* = "maulwurf," i. e., "erdaufwerfer." "Die bedeutung 'erde' ergibt sich aus dem synonymum *mult-uurf* Graff I, 1042 zu *molta* got. *mulda*." The second element *spilli* is explained as related to O.E. *spillan*, "verzehren, verderben, zu grunde richten," and the meaning of the whole word is therefore, according to Kögel, "erdvernichtung." Neither the one nor the other equation is convincing: see Bugge, *Studier*, p. 419; Dettler, *Beitr.*, Vol. XXI, p. 107;

<sup>1</sup> In PAUL's *Grundriss*, Vol. II 2, p. III.



Mogk, Paul's *Grundriss*, III<sup>2</sup>, p. 382, who rejects all theories.<sup>1</sup> Kögel further explains O.S. *mūd(t)spelli* as due to the influence of the word which appears in M.H.G. as *mot*, "schwarze torfartige erde, moor, morast," cf. *mutwurf*. Kauffman,<sup>2</sup> who accepts Kögel's interpretation of *mū-* ("erdhaufen, hügel," O.E. *mūga*, *mūwa*, "heap," cf. Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.*, s. v. *maulwurf*), holds the strange doctrine that O.H.G. *mūspilli* and O.S. *mūd(t)spelli* are two distinct words, distinct in meaning and in origin:

Hier [in the *Heliand*] haben wir es auch mit einem andern wort zu tun. . . . Man wird daher gut tun mit ahd. *muspilli* zwar anord. *muspell* zu vereinigen, aber as. *mutspelli* vorerst fernzuhalten, denn es liegt nicht bloss ein anderes wortgebilde, sondern auch die verschiedenheit der wortbedeutung zu tage.

He has reached this desperate conclusion because he finds Braune's definition<sup>3</sup> of *mūspilli* as "weltuntergang, jüngster tag" impossible for the Bavarian poem, but correct for the *mūd(t)spelli* of the *Heliand*. In the Norse mythology, he says, the world is really not destroyed, but sinks into the sea (*stgr fold i mar*, *Vsp.*, 40, 2; Jónsson's ed.), and hence *mūspell*, *mūspilli* cannot mean "erdvernichtung." The word *spilli* must be related to German *spalten*, and the meaning of the compound is therefore, in Kauffmann's opinion, "erdspaltung." What to do with O.S. *mūd(t)spelli* is a question which he does not answer.

Even if it should be granted that the equation *spilli* = "vernichtung, zerstörung" or "spaltung" is a good one, nothing that has been brought forward in regard to the word *mū* is sufficient to render it at all probable that it might have had or got the value of "mundus, world;" nor is it any clearer that *mūd(t)spelli* (>*muspilli*) passed from the meaning "heidebrand" to "weltbrand" (Martin, to whom the first element is cognate with English *mud*). But the theories of the identity of *spilli* with O.E. *spillan*<sup>4</sup> or German *spalten*, are merely phonological speculations and form only wretched foundations for the building up of any plausible explanation. The only thing that is certain about *mū*, (in *mū-*

<sup>1</sup> A theory similar to Kögel's is that of MARTIN, *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 186; cf. also WOESTE, *Zeitschr. f. d. Philologie*, Vol. IX, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 5 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ahd. *Lesebuch*, 4. Aufl., 1897.

<sup>4</sup> O.E. *spillan* < O.N. *spilla* = O.S. *spildian*.

werf), if it indeed be identical with O.E. *mūha*, *mūga*, *mūwa*, is that it never appears anywhere in the sense postulated,<sup>1</sup> and the same is also true of M.H.G. *mot*, English *mud*. The definitions of *spilli* as "vernichtung" and as "spaltung" are born of a desire to make the original meaning of the word fit as closely as possible to the meaning it seems to have in the texts. So we have two improbable theories for the whole compound, one for each element, and it is no wonder that neither Kögel's nor Kauffman's solution of the problem has met with wide acceptance.<sup>2</sup>

Since the word *mūspilli*, *mūd(t)spilli*, first occurs in Christian environments it is most natural to infer that its source may most likely be found in Christian material. No one will find any fault with this inference. But if anyone shall reject my proof for the correctness of it, he cannot use the Christian setting of the word as proof that it is of heathen origin.

From this inference I pass to another which seems very reasonable from a linguistic point of view: *mūspilli*, *mūd(t)spilli*, *mūspell* are one and the same word and are derived from one ground-form. The various forms of the word are most easily accounted for by assuming that the first element was originally \**mūd-*, which could naturally become *mū-* on account of the similarity between voiceless *ð* and *s*. In O.S. *mūd-* and *mūt-* appear for the same reason that *ð* in *sōð* becomes *d* or *t* in *sodspel*, *Heliand*, 3838, Cott. MS, *suotspel*, München MS.<sup>3</sup> If \**mūd-* was the first element of the word, it follows that it is a borrowed word in the Norse sources of a hundred years later (*Völuspá*, *Lokasenna*), as well as in the Bavarian poem *Mūspilli*. From Low German it may have traveled both northward and southward, as many scholars have assumed.

Our next step must be the consideration of the identity of the parts and the meaning of the whole. If the word was originally \**mūd-spelli*, then we may reasonably say that this word does look

<sup>1</sup> The word is well represented in the Scandinavian languages, but never, so far as I am aware, does any usage of it support Kögel's theory.

<sup>2</sup> E. H. MEYER, *Die Mythologie der Germanen* (Strassburg, 1903), pp. 499 f., gives up the problem in despair: "Das wort, von dem kaum der zweite teil *spell* mit einiger sicherheit als rede, botschaft, weissagung erklärt werden kann, der erste teil *mu*, *mud*, *muf* aber rätselhaft bleibt, mag schon heidnisch gewesen und ein grosses feuer bedeutet haben."

<sup>3</sup> BUGGE, *Studier*, p. 420, footnote.

very much like *mūd*, "mouth," in composition with *spellī*, which may be a by-form of *spell* (cf. O.S. *beddi*: *bed*), and the identity of the second element is thus determined by the first; its precise meaning it may be difficult or impossible to know without a knowledge of the origin of the whole word, but it is, at any rate, the same word as O.E. *spell*, "saying, message, tale, discourse." As a word meaning "something spoken by word of mouth" it is analogous to several words cited by Detter<sup>1</sup> in this connection: O.E. *mūd-hæl*, "salutary words" (cf. Dan. and Norw. *mund-held*, "talemaade som en person idelig fører i munden"<sup>2</sup>), O.N. *munnrøða*, "rede," Du. *mondgesprek*, "gespräch," German *mundsprache*, "mündliche verabredung." Each one of these has its own peculiar history to account for its special meaning, and if *müspellī* (<\**mūdspellī*) means "something spoken by word of mouth," the problem is to discover what peculiar history it has had in order to account for its use in poems dealing with the end of the world.

It will be objected that \**mūd*- in the hypothetical form \**mūdspellī* need not necessarily have been the original form word, just as O.E. *corn-trēow*, "cornel tree," has nothing to do with *corn* except by popular etymology, for it is only Latin *cornulium* remade, and this should rather have yielded \**horn-trēow*. And just here someone might urge Bugge's theory,<sup>3</sup> which has recently been essentially restated by Golther.<sup>4</sup> The first element \**mūd*- arose, says Bugge, from a \**mundspellī* in which \**mund*- is borrowed from Latin *mundus*, "world." This \**mund*- was by Saxons or Frisians identified with the word *mund*, "mouth," used by neighboring High Germans, and thus changed into their own native *mūd*. The meaning of \**mundspellī* was "prophecy concerning the end of the world, *consummatio mundi*, *finis mundi*." An essential part of this prophecy was the destruction of the world by fire, and so *mudspellī* came to mean "world-fire."

That a word meaning prophecy concerning a certain catastrophe might come to mean the catastrophe itself is a process for

<sup>1</sup> "Müspellī," *Beitr.*, Vol. XXI, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> See FALK OG TORP, *Etym. Odb.*, s. v.

<sup>3</sup> Studier, p. 420.

<sup>4</sup> *Germanische Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1895), pp. 539 ff.; but see the "Nachträge," p. 660, where he displays signs of weakness of faith in the identity of the first element with *mundus*.

which many analogies could be mentioned (cf. O.E. *dōm*, N.E. *doom*, *fate*, etc.), and it is not here that the weakness of Bugge's theory lies. It is his theory concerning the origin of the element \**mūd*-, which must, it seems to me, be regarded as highly improbable on account of its complex character. There is no \**mund-spelli*, but we may be reasonably sure of a \**mūd-spelli*; there is, moreover, no Latin loan-word \**mund* (< *mundus*); and we cannot feel certain that Low Germans, who possessed many words ending in *-und* (*mund*, "hand," for example), would be very likely to change \**mund-* to *mūd-* in a word which need not necessarily have called up the idea of "mouth."

In his article on *Mūspilli* in *Beitr.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 107 f., Detter avoids the circuitous route of Bugge in his search for the identity of \**mūd*. He allows the genuineness of \**mūd*- and accepts it at its face value. The first element is *mūd*, "mouth," the second means "verkündigung," and the whole, "mündliche verkündigung," is a "freie [here Kauffmann<sup>1</sup> adds an !] wiedergabe" of Latin *prophetia*, "prophecy concerning the end of the world." The difficulty here is to find sufficient proof for such a translation. Selma Dorff<sup>2</sup> has recently tried to show that *mūspilli* is a "synonymum von *urdēli*, *urteili*, der verdammende spruch des richters. Es ist die poetische wiedergabe des neutestamentlichen *κρίμα*, das lateinisch mit *judicium*, *damnatio*, von Luther wechselweise mit *urteil* und *gericht* übersetzt ist." Between Detter's "freie" and Selma Dorff's "poetische wiedergabe" there can be little choice. A prophecy would seem just as likely to be called a "mündliche verkündigung" as *κρίμα*, *judicium*, *gericht*, a "slow mouth-utterance."<sup>3</sup> One might almost as well look for the origin of *mūspilli* in the voice of the trumpet,<sup>4</sup> which some

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschrift f. d. Phil.*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, Vol. CX, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> SELMA DORFF, *ibid.*, p. 5: Goth. *spillōn*, O.H.G. *spellōn*, etc.,—"langsam auseinander-setzend sprechen," especially so in pronouncing judgment.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Matt. 24:31: *mittet angelos suos cum tuba et voce magna*; Honorius: *angeli sonitu tubae terribile judicium Dei intonabunt* (cited by E. H. MEYER, *Völuspá*, p. 190); the Norwegian *Draumkvæde*, 33:

Det var sankte Sále-Mikkjel,  
han bles i luren den lange:  
Og no skal alle sálinne  
fram fyr domén gange.

—*Norske Følleviser*, ed. TH. LAMMERS, Krb., 1901, p. 14.

angel, Michael for instance, will put to his mouth on the last day when all men are summoned to doom.

At this point it may be mentioned that already Jakob Grimm, in the first edition of his grammar, it seems, glossed *müspilli* "oris eloquium" (also "mutationis nuncius," as a suggestion on the assumption that *müspilli* might be from an original \**mut-spelli*), but without result, for in his *Mythology*<sup>1</sup> he gives another theory which, however, need not be reviewed here. It has seemed a simple matter to get thus far, but it is right here that difficulties begin, as the theories which have just been mentioned show: it has not been proved that the ground-form \**mūdspellī* is correct, although it has been deduced by the application of rational principles of philology.

I shall now try to show that all those who have assumed an original form \**mūdspellī*, with a meaning like Grimm's "oris eloquium," have been on the right track, and that particularly Bugge and Detter, in so far as the second element of the word is concerned, have come very near to what I believe to be the true origin of the word: *müspilli*, \**mūdspellī*, is an etymological translation of the Latin word *oraculum*, and its use in Christian poems dealing with the great events prophesied to take place at the end of the world (and in a sense "world-fire, world-end," or whatever the meaning may be in each case) is due to the presence, in northwestern Germany, either of a sibylline oracle in the Latin language or of citations from such an oracle in writings dealing with the same subject (*e. g.*, a homily, a treatise, a poem). In addition to what has already been said concerning the Christian setting<sup>2</sup> of the word in the German poems of the ninth century, it must here be emphasized that this really means a learned setting, for the Christian culture of the time was its highest learning; and this learning was dependent upon the Latin language for its existence. The O.H.G. poem *Müspilli* (so named by Schmeller) and the O.S. *Heliand* are both learned poems and represent the highest culture of their time. They are the work of learned men, and these are incon-

<sup>1</sup> *Teutonic Mythology*, translated by STALLYBRASS, Vol. II, p. 800.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. KÖGEL, in PAUL's *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, Vol. II, p. 111: "Nichts in dem gedicht mit einziger ausnahme des wortes *müspilli* wurzelt noch in dem boden des heidentums."

ceivable without assuming the existence of learned predecessors. An etymological translation, such as I have mentioned, was surely within the bounds of the Christian learning of a much earlier time than that of the *Heliand* and the *Muspilli*. A very slight acquaintance with the Latin language would be sufficient to enable the creator of the term *muspilli* to recognize the similarity between Latin *oraculum* and *os* (*oris, ore, ora*, etc.), "mouth." The probability that this is the correct explanation of *muspilli* is, I believe, raised to a reasonable certainty by an actual case in which *oraculum* is etymologically described, in effect, as a "mouth-utterance," a *\*mūdspellī: Quid est enim oraculum? nempe voluntas divina hominis ORE ENUNCIATA*, Seneca, *Controv.*, 1 praef.: "What then is an oracle? Forsooth it is the divine will declared through the mouth of man." Seneca's *ore enunciata* corresponds as closely as possible to *muspilli*, and for the same reason: the Roman and the German are both thinking of the Latin word *os* (gen. *oris*), "mouth," and Seneca would hardly have come nearer to the German *\*mūdspellī*, conditioned as it is by the Germanic method of compounding words, if he had said *oris eloquium*.

Bugge<sup>2</sup> based his explanation of *muspilli* on the probable existence in northwestern Germany of a prophecy concerning *mundus* (*\*mundspellī*) and took occasion to express his agreement in opinion with Müllenhoff in his belief that the doctrine of the destruction of the world must have spread over the Germanic world in the form of a prophecy. Müllenhoff's statement is, as usual, very emphatic:

Die ansicht von dem künftigen weltuntergang, die uns das *muspilli*—*mūdspellī* bei den Südgermanen verbürgt, kann in der germanischen welt nur in der form einer verkündigung und prophezeiung verbreitung gefunden haben, und dass weise frauen von anfang an ihrer annahmen, wie noch die Alemannin Thiota, der die mainzer synode im j. 847 den process machte (Myth.<sup>3</sup> 78 f., 679), für sie mit ihrem ansehen eintraten und gewähr leisteten bis etwa andre sie ablösten, . . . dies ist eine folgerung der sich niemand entziehen wird.<sup>3</sup>

Also Detter, who considers *muspilli* a free translation of Latin *prophetia*, stands on the same ground. It would be futile

<sup>1</sup> ANDREWS, *Lat. Lex.*, s. v.    <sup>2</sup> *Studier*, pp. 418 f.    <sup>3</sup> *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, Vol. V, pp. 67 f.

to try to guess in what particular form of literature the originator of the term *müspilli* found the word *oraculum*, "prophecy concerning the end of the world." Was it in a complete sibylline oracle, was it in a homily on the end of the world, or was it in a Latin poem on the same favorite subject? Whatever be the answer to this question, the following considerations will be pertinent to it.

The antique Christian Sibylline Oracles prophesy concerning the end of the world, and, in the words of Bang, "die begebenheiten der zukunfft (werden) so gut wie ausschliesslich von einem biblischen gesichtspunkte aus behandelt."<sup>1</sup> The material of these oracles bearing on the end of the world may also be indicated through Bang's analysis of a few of them:

Orac. Sib. II, 156 fg.:

1. sittlicher verfall;
2. pest, hunger, krieg;
3. nacht legt sich über die erde;
4. weltbrand;
5. auferstehung;
6. das gericht kommt;
7. die frommen in das elysische land;
8. die gottlosen in den Tartarus.

Orac. Sib. IV, 152 fg.:

1. moralische verderbniss;
2. krieg;
3. getöse und gebrüll in der luft;
4. weltbrand;
5. auferstehung; eine neue erde entsteht;
6. das gericht kommt;
7. die gottlosen werden in den Tartarus gestürzt;
8. die frommen leben ein glückliches leben auf der neuen erde.

Orac. Sib. VII, 140 fg.:

1. moralische verderbniss;
2. krieg und verwüstung;
3. weltbrand;
4. tiefe nacht;
5. ein neues glückliches geschlecht wird erschaffen.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BANG, *Vpluspá und die sibyllinischen Orakel*, übersetzt von POESTION (Wien, 1880), pp. 7 f.

<sup>2</sup> BANG, *ibid.*, pp. 28 f.



To those who are unfamiliar with the character of the sibylline poetry the above will be sufficient to show that the possible early existence in Germany of such a poetry, in Latin, might have given occasion for the translation of the word *oraculum*, and they will also see why such a word should crop out in poetry dealing with the subject of the end, the destruction, of the world, the world-fire.

Was there such a sibylline poetry in the Middle Ages? The answer is affirmative, but the subject no doubt needs a fuller treatment than it has yet received. There was such a literature in the vernacular in Germany in the fourteenth century,<sup>1</sup> but with this we need not now concern us. Dr. Bang has in his *Et sibyllinsk Orakel fra Middelalderen* (Christiania, 1882)<sup>2</sup> published a critical text of a Latin sibylline oracle composed in the last part of the eleventh or first part of the twelfth century, presumably by a Lombard. He shows that this author has, among other sources, drawn upon a *Libellus de Antichristo* written by Adso, abbot in the cloister Moutier-en-Der, at the request of Queen Gerberga, sister of Otto I., between the years 949 and 954. This Adso has, according to his own statement, taken certain material from sibylline verses, "sicut in sibyllinis versibus habemus." Says Bang:<sup>3</sup>

There has therefore, in the time of Adso been in circulation a sibylline composition in verse. . . . This poetry is, it seems, the connecting link between Adso and the old (antique, Jewish-Christian-pagan) oracles, and it reveals indisputably the influence of these in its name-method.

Bang also tries to show that the oracle published by him contains many evidences of connection with the antique sibylline oracles, and that the similarities cannot be explained by assuming as connecting links the church Fathers with their citations from, or references to, the oracles, or certain mediæval tractates concerning them.

This does not, of course, prove the existence of a Latin sibylline oracle in northwestern Germany before the composition of the

<sup>1</sup> See Voort, "Ueber Sibyllen Weissagung," *Beitr.*, Vol. IV (1877), pp. 79 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In *Christiania Videnskabselskabs Forhandlingar*, No. 9. In the same series, No. 8, same year, is found also DR. BANG'S *Bidrag til de Sibyllinske Oraklers og den Sib. Orakeldigtning i Middelalderen*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14 f.

*Heliand* and the *Muspilli*, but it shows that this form of literature was known in Germany at an early period. I have no doubt that more material will be brought forward on this point.

There remains to be mentioned one other matter which may have some bearing on this question. The existence of a poem of the character of *Völuspá* in the so-called *Elder Edda* suggests in this connection the thought that the type of poetry of which it is an example may have been due to foreign influence, just as the word *Múspell*, which occurs in it,<sup>1</sup> surely is of Low German origin. It is true that Bugge has removed the word *Múspell*, although it is found in all MSS, and in this he has been followed by most editors. Against this procedure A. Olrik enters an energetic protest,<sup>2</sup> chiefly on the ground that it is a violation of the principle that one must not seek to bring old sources into agreement with younger systematic presentations. Our understanding of the old mythological poetry must not always be determined by Snorre Sturluson's views, for he is clearly not a safe guide.<sup>3</sup> From the point of view that has been gained with respect to the un-Germanic origin of the word *Múspell* we shall feel little inclined to insist upon the removal of the word. Through it we have gained some insight into the character of Norse mythology; it is a composite structure built up of widely different elements. The study of the *Völuspá* has had an unfortunate history. Scholars seem to have been intimidated to a certain extent by Møllenhoff's violent criticism of Bang and Bugge in his *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, Vol.

<sup>1</sup> *Vsp.*, 35 (B. 51):

Kjóll ferr austan,  
koma mono Múspells  
of lög lýðer,  
en Loke stýrer.

(Jónsson's text with substitution of MS readings *austan* and *Múspells* for Bugge's emendations *norþan* and *Heljar*).

Cf. also *Lokasenna*, 42, 4: en es Múspells syner

ripa Myrkvið yfer,  
veizta þá, vesall, hvé vegr.

The conception of *Múspell* which is the basis for the expressions *Múspells lýðer*, *syner*, may, as OLRIK, *loc. cit.*, pp. 224 f., suggests, be due to a sentence like O. S. *Múspelles megin obar manferð*; cf. SNORRE's *Múspells megir*.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 222, footnote; see also SCHÖNING, *Dødsrigger i nordisk Hedentro* (Kjøbenhavn, 1903), p. 47. KAUFFMANN, *Zeitschrift f. d. Philologie*, Vol. XXXV (1903), p. 405, is not inclined to follow Olrik on this point. Cf. on this matter also DETTER, *Die Völuspa* (Wien, 1899), p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> To SNORRE *Múspell*, *Múspellsheimr* is a fire-world, not a world-fire.

V, and the theory which the former advanced with regard to the *Völuspá* has never received the attention it deserves. It matters little that Bang's guess that the author of *Völuspá* came into touch with the antique Sibylline Oracles in Ireland, either in the original or in an Irish translation,<sup>1</sup> has turned out to be improbable. I notice that Bugge still expresses his faith in the connection of the *Völuspá* with mediæval sibylline poetry:

Germanic heathendom was familiar with seeresses of supernatural powers, who were treated with respect. But the giant-fostered seeress in *Völuspá*, who turns her gaze toward the whole human race and meditates upon the fate of the world from its first beginning to its destruction and resurrection, has unquestionably Christian prototypes, and shows particular kinship with the sibyls of the Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup>

This will in time surely be universally recognized, even if it will not be insisted on, with Bugge (and Müllenhoff), that the "first germ of the poem is to be found there, where the word *Múspell* has its origin,"<sup>3</sup> on account of the fact that "the prophecy of the *völva* is inseparable from the belief in the destruction of the world by fire, for which the particular term was *Múspell*." The origin of the word *Múspell* from the Latin word *oraculum* does not prove for the *Völuspá* direct connection with an *oraculum Sibyllae*. There may have been many connecting links, which it may be impossible for us to recognize. But the appearance of a word like *Múspell-oraculum* in the *Völuspá* (and in the *Lokasenna*, both of the tenth century) is surely significant for the question of foreign influence, and should, it seems to me, open the subject for renewed investigation and discussion.

SIVERT N. HAGEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

<sup>1</sup> *Völuspá*, pp. 42 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Home of the Eddic Poems*, tr. by SCHOFIELD (London, 1899), *Introd.*, p. xxix; cf. also p. 11; see also GOLTHER, *Germanische Mythologie*, p. 653: "Zwar soll nicht behauptet werden, dass wort und begriff *Völva* aus der Sibylle abzuleiten sei, wol aber, dass eine nordische *Völva*, ein fahrendes zauberweib, als seherin und prophetin in so erhabenem stile nicht denkbar ist ohne das vorbild der Sibylle."

<sup>3</sup> *Studier*, p. 421. I do not, of course, intend to impugn the essential correctness of the statement quoted, but rather to call attention to the need of a somewhat different formulation, and to take account of the possibly kaleidoscopic character of the poem with respect to prototypes and materials.

## THE AUTHORSHIP OF LOCRINE.<sup>1</sup>

TWO DRAMATISTS, Peele and Greene, have been seriously considered by modern critics in connection with the authorship of *Locrine*. The internal evidence furnished by this play and by the acknowledged writings, on the one hand, of Peele and, on the other, of Greene is, in my opinion, sufficient to establish the claims of the former. To present this evidence is the object of this paper.

*Locrine* was entered on the Stationers' Register by Thomas Creede, July 20, 1594.<sup>2</sup> No mention is there made of the author of the play. Under the supervision of an editor, "W. S.,"<sup>3</sup> it was published in November or December of 1595.

The date of composition can be fixed as not earlier than 1590. Charles Crawford, in an article on "Edmund Spenser, 'Locrine,' and 'Selimus,'" showed undoubted borrowings in *Locrine* from Spenser's "The Ruines of Rome," "Visions of the World's Vanitie," "The Teares of the Muses," and "The Ruines of Time." Although two of these poems had probably been long known in manuscript copies, one, "The Teares of the Muses," was of more recent composition, and "The Ruines of Time" was certainly not written before 1589;<sup>4</sup> and, if the statement in the article on "Spenser" in the *Dictionary of National Biography*,<sup>5</sup> signed by J. W. Hales and Sidney Lee, be correct, namely, that the death of Walsingham is lamented in the poem, then *Locrine* was not written earlier than 1590, the year of Walsingham's death. In fact, none of these poems was published before 1591, when they appeared in the *Complaints*, and it is extremely doubtful if the author of *Locrine* saw all of them before their appear-

<sup>1</sup> HAZLITT, *Doubtful Plays of Shakspeare* (London, 1887). All references to *Locrine* are to this edition.

<sup>2</sup> ARBER'S *Transcript of the Registers*, etc. (London, October 1, 1875), Vol. II, p. 656.

<sup>3</sup> The discussion of the identity of the initials "W. S." will not enter into this paper. There is no satisfactory reason for regarding him as the author of the play.

<sup>4</sup> *Notes and Queries*, Series 9, Vol. VII (1901), pp. 61, 101, 142, 208, 261, 324, 384.

<sup>5</sup> *Edmund Spenser*, Globe edition, 1890, pp. xlv, 489.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. LIII, p. 301.

ance in that volume. Moreover, my study of the play and the discovery of undoubted dependence between it and Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* lead me to the conviction that the two plays were written, not only by the same author, but at about the same time and under the same influence—that of Marlowe—and that *Lochrine* is the later of the two.

Of the two dramatists under consideration, Robert Greene was born about 1560 and died in 1592.<sup>1</sup> George Peele was born about 1552. He is known to have been alive in 1596, but was dead in 1598.<sup>2</sup>

#### GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE.

On reading *Lochrine* and the plays of Peele and Greene, I was at once struck by the marked resemblance in diction and manner of expression between *Lochrine* and Peele's plays, and the equally marked difference in diction and manner of expression between *Lochrine* and the plays of Greene. One of the most striking peculiarities of Greene's plays is the padding of his lines with redundant prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs, and the use of expressions fast becoming obsolete in his own time:

"That though that they be clapped up in clay."—*Alphonsus*.

"To like so of the English monarch's son."—*F. B. and F. B.*

"To cease of this quarrel."—*F. B. and F. B.*

"But leaving these such glories as they be."—*Orlando Furioso*.

Turning to *Lochrine* and Peele, one sees a change to much greater compactness of expression. Comparatively few redundant words are used. Many of the expressions noted in Greene are not found in Peele or in *Lochrine*, and the others are used sparingly. "If that," equivalent to "if," is found in the four of Greene's plays 23 times; it does not occur at all in *Lochrine* or in the four plays of Peele (omitting the prose play *Old Wives' Tale*). "As that," equivalent to "that," occurs in Greene 15 times; I did

<sup>1</sup> The date of the composition of none of GREENE's plays is known. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, *Orlando Furioso*, *James IV.*, and *Alphonsus, King of Arragon* form the principal basis of my study of Greene for this discussion. All references to these plays are to DYCE's *The Dramatic and Poetical Works of Robert Greene and George Peele* (London, 1861).

<sup>2</sup> PEELE's *Arraignment of Paris* was published in 1584. *David and Bethsabe*, published in 1599, was probably written next. *Edward I.* was published in 1593. *The Battle of Alcazar*, published in 1594, is first mentioned in HENSLOWE's *Diary*, February 29, 1591-92. All references to Peele's works are to BULLEN's *The Works of George Peele*, 2 vols. (London, 1888).

not find it in *Locrine*, or Peele. "As," meaning "that," and used as a relative after "so," is found 18 times in Greene, not at all in *Locrine*, and only twice in Peele. The accompanying table of these expressions (p. 4 below) does not represent by any means all such uses in Greene.

The totals are striking. Of the expressions noted, 11 instances of their use are found in Peele, 6 in *Locrine*, and 160 in Greene.

The use of "for to" with an infinitive illustrates the same difference between Greene on the one side, and *Locrine* and Peele on the other. Peele is as sparing of his use of "for to" as of the expressions noted above. In all his plays and poems I counted 12 instances. In *Locrine* it is used only 4 times. In the four plays of Greene it occurs 93 times.<sup>1</sup>

I find some expressions of frequent use in *Locrine* common also to Peele, but not used by Greene. "Latest," "fell," "coal-black," "ugly," and "grim" are favorite adjectives in *Locrine*. These all occur in Peele. I found none of them in Greene, nor does Grosart give any of them in his glossary of Greene,<sup>2</sup> except "coal-black," which occurs in *Selimus*, wrongly, I think, ascribed to Greene.<sup>3</sup> The expressions "grim Minos" and "grim Jupiter" occur both in *Locrine* and Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*. "Bowels" and "entrails," used often of inanimate nature as well as of parts of the body, are common. In *Locrine* "bowels" occurs 10 times; in Peele 11 times.<sup>4</sup> In Greene it occurs only once—in *Orlando*

PEELE					Locrine-4					GREENE				
The A. of P.	-	-	-	4						O. F.	-	-	-	4
D. & B.	-	-	-	..	Total	-	-	-	4	James IV.	-	-	-	12
The B. of A.	-	-	-	..						F. B. & F. B.	-	-	-	12
Ed. I.	-	-	-	6						Alphonsus	-	-	-	65
O. W. Tale	-	-	-	1						Total	-	-	-	93
Poems	-	-	-	1										
Total	-	-	-	12										

Note that in the table two apparent exceptions occur, PEELE's *Edward I.* and GREENE's *Orlando Furioso*. These may perhaps be accounted for by the fortunes of the manuscripts of these two plays. *Edward I.* has descended in a mutilated form and "the text throughout is vile," says BULLEN (*Peele's Works*, Vol. I, p. xxxii). *Orlando Furioso*, says DYCE, was printed from a very imperfect copy and much of the text has been supplied by other hands (*Works of Greene and Peele*, p. 31).

It is true that in *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clomydes*, included by Dyce among Peele's plays, I found 76 "for to's." But this fact alone, aside from evidences of diction, style, and theme, and characterization, is conclusive against Peele's authorship of that play.

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene*, 1881-86, Vol. XV.

<sup>2</sup> "Fell" and "latest" are also used in *Selimus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Edward I.*, once; *Poems*, twice; *D. & B.*, 8 times.

*Furioso*. "Entrails" occurs in *Locrine* 3 times; in *Peele* 4 times;<sup>1</sup> not at all in *Greene*. Neither of these words is in *Grosart's* glossary.

#### FIGURES OF SPEECH.

The abundance of imagery in *Locrine* suggested a comparison with *Peele's* use of imagery. Taking Professor Carpenter's

	PEELE					<i>Locrine</i>	GREENE				
	<i>A. of P.</i>	<i>D. &amp; B.</i>	<i>B. of A.</i>	<i>Ed. I.</i>	Total		<i>O. F.</i>	<i>F. B. &amp; F. B.</i>	<i>J. IV.</i>	<i>Alph.</i>	Total
"As" = that.....	..	..	1	1	2	..	8	1	4	5	18
"As that" = that.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	13	15
"As if that" = as if.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
"An" = if.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2	..	..	11
"An if" = and if.....	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	2	..	1	6
"And why" = why.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	6	..	7
"After that" = after.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
"For that" = because.....	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	4
"For why" = because.....	..	..	1	2	3	..	3	2	..	..	8
"For because" = because.....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	9	9
"For yet" = yet.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
"How that" = how.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
"How that" = that.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	5	8
"If that" = if.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	2	18	23
"If so" = if.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	5
"Since that" = since.....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	13	14
"So that" = if.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	2
"Such" (redundant).....	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	5
"Then as" = as.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
"Up" (redundant).....	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	3	..	..	4
"When so" = when.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2
"Whereas" = where.....	..	..	1	1	2	2	..	..	3	6	9
"That" = because.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
"How" = as.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	2
Total .....	1	..	3	7	11	6	25	26	38	71	100

*Metaphor and Simile in the Minor Elizabethan Drama*<sup>3</sup> as a basis for my study of *Peele's* imagery and comparing the result with the imagery of *Locrine*, I found all that is there given concerning *Peele* practically true also of *Locrine*. Carpenter says:

*Peele* was in fact a poet rather than a dramatist, and it is by his poetical gifts alone that he attains his slender measure of success. His imagery is seldom condensed and emphatic, and is seen at its best in his two most

<sup>1</sup> *The A. of P.*, once; *D. & B.*, once; *The B. of A.*, twice.

<sup>2</sup> "As" = "that," and used as a relative after "so." The instances of "as" after "such" were not counted because that is the modern use.

<sup>3</sup> Chicago, 1895.



poetical pieces, *The Arraignment of Paris* and *David and Bethsabe*. When he attempts to be dramatic, as in *The Battle of Alcazar* and *Edward I.*, he becomes strained and turgid.<sup>1</sup>

This is certainly true of *Locrine*. The author is by all means a poet rather than a dramatist, and whatever may be said for its qualities as a drama, the imagery of *Locrine* is worthy of praise; not the praise, however, bestowed on that of *David and Bethsabe*; *Locrine* partakes too much of the character of Peele's later dramatic work to merit that; but it does combine somewhat of the poetical qualities of *The Arraignment of Paris* and *David and Bethsabe* with the strained and stilted style of *Edward I.* and *The Battle of Alcazar*.

Taking up the imagery more in detail, I find the following seven characteristics of Peele's imagery cited by Carpenter true also of that of *Locrine*:

1. It is "seldom condensed and emphatic."<sup>2</sup>
2. It is generally "extrinsic and ornamental."<sup>3</sup>
3. Peele is "fond of simile and his imagery runs to extended passages rather than to short and burning figures."<sup>4</sup> In *Locrine* there are as many as 47 formal similes, including 18 of the prolonged or Homeric type.<sup>5</sup>
4. The statement that "nature, and especially inanimate nature, affords by far the larger proportion of Peele's metaphors and similes,"<sup>6</sup> is true also of *Locrine*. Of a total of 47 formal similes, 34 are nature similes and 21 of these are of inanimate nature in whole or in part. Of 21 metaphors 16 are nature metaphors, and 9 of the 16 are of inanimate nature.
5. Peele's "range is not great. Stars, sky, sun, and flowers play the largest part."<sup>7</sup> Aspects of the sea also enter into the imagery of Peele.<sup>8</sup> These elements enter largely into the imagery of *Locrine*.<sup>9</sup>
6. The body and its parts are often used in Peele's imagery.<sup>10</sup> Bowels and entrails, especially in connection with inanimate

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Prolonged similes: pp. 59-60, 60, 60, 64-5, 65, 68, 69, 69, 70, 75, 75, 78, 86, 87, 94, 96, 100, 103.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 26.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>9</sup> Stars: pp. 64, 82; sky: pp. 60, 64, 73, 81, 97, 97, 99, 99; sun: pp. 61, 61, 69, 70, 75, 80, 88, 97, 101; flowers: 69, 76, 88, 97; sea and rivers: pp. 65, 69, 69, 72, 75, 80, 87, 88, 88, 88.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

nature, occur often. This is likewise true of *Locrine*: pp. 61, 63, 63, 87.

7. An especially frequent and characteristic tag of Peele's style, says Carpenter,<sup>1</sup> is the image of "piercing." Examples of this in *Locrine* are found on pp. 61, 67, 92.

Lack of space forbids my quoting in full the above citations. Reference to them, however, by the reader will convince him of the very close similarity between the character and sources of the imagery of *Locrine* and the character and sources of that of Peele.

Let us now look for a moment at the imagery of Greene's plays. In contrast to the richness and abundance of imagery in *Locrine* and Peele, Carpenter's conclusions regarding Greene are striking:

The inferiority of Greene as a dramatic poet appears in the general poverty and commonplaceness of his imagery. Hallam thinks that he is "a little redundant in images," but this criticism can apply only to the *Orlando Furioso*, where Greene's peculiar pseudo-classical imagery is heaped up in superabundant measure. Otherwise his imagery is somewhat scanty. He uses few striking and original metaphors.<sup>2</sup>

In marked contrast also to the comparatively well-defined and often-used sources of imagery in *Locrine* and Peele, Carpenter says this of Greene: "Greene's range is narrow and is emphasized in no particular direction."<sup>3</sup> Again, in contrast to the fact that by far the larger proportion of the similes and metaphors of *Locrine* and Peele are afforded by nature, we find that "nature is only slightly represented in his [Greene's] plays."<sup>4</sup> Very few examples are given of the aspects of the sky, of the stars, sun, or flowers;<sup>5</sup> none are given of the sea or of rivers (compare the striking examples in *Locrine* and Peele). In contrast with the frequent figurative use in *Locrine* and Peele of "bowels" and "entrails," I find only one instance in Greene—that of "bowels" in *Orlando Furioso* (p. 89). This instance also is the only one cited by Carpenter.<sup>6</sup> Of the image of "piercing," so often found in *Locrine* and Peele, Carpenter gives no examples from Greene. I myself found none.

In grammatical structure, the use of certain adjectives and nouns, and in imagery, therefore, we have seen not only a marked

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

difference between Greene, on the one side, and *Locrine* and Peele, on the other, but also unusual similarity between *Locrine* and Peele. In the following discussion of versification I shall confine myself to showing further resemblances between *Locrine* and the plays of Peele. Greene I shall refer to again.

## VERSIFICATION.

My count of feminine endings, run-on lines, incomplete lines,<sup>1</sup> broken lines,<sup>2</sup> and rhyming lines shows the same similarity between *Locrine* and the plays of Peele. But, while the preceding tests are positive, this is somewhat negative in its application. Its chief result is that it furnishes no disproof of Peele's authorship. Owing to the fact that the text of *Edward I.* has come down to us in a greatly mutilated condition, I made no study of the versification of that play. Moreover, the figures that follow are only for the blank-verse passages of these plays.<sup>3</sup>

	Feminine Endings	Run-on Lines	Incomplete Lines	Broken Lines	Rhyming Lines
<i>Arraignment of Paris</i> ..	2.65%	1 in 8.54	0.00%	0	1.59%
<i>David and Bethsabe</i> ....	4.27	1 in 8.20	0.42	1	3.42
<i>Battle of Alcazar</i> .....	3.23	1 in 6.79	1.51	0	1.92
<i>Locrine</i> .....	1.10	1 in 8.07	0.52	1	4.92

## TREATMENT OF THEME.

In the treatment of the theme, or the attitude of the author to his plot, *Locrine* and the plays of Peele are distinguished from those of Greene. In both *Locrine* and all the tragedies of Peele the story is told with moral earnestness and insistence on moral laws of retribution. There is no hint in either *Locrine* or Peele of the weak and sentimental temporizing and condoning of vice or crime, and the easy and sudden repentance of the sinner, found, for instance, in Greene's *James IV.* and the *Looking-Glass for London and England*. Greene, in his plays at least, takes

<sup>1</sup> Lines shorter than the regular ten-syllabled lines.

<sup>2</sup> Instances where one line is divided among two or more speakers.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore the figures for the *Arraignment of Paris* apply only to the four blank verse passages: the Prologus, pp. 5, 6; the speech of Paris, pp. 58-59; the speech of Diana, pp. 68, 69; and from the speech of Clotho to the end of Diana's, pp. 71, 72. In *David and Bethsabe* and in *Locrine* I have omitted the lyrics.

the moral world lightly. His characters sin and repent with equal facility, and weaknesses of character or crimes against others are just as quickly forgiven and as soon forgotten. James in *James IV.*, Prince Edward and Lacy in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, are examples. Indeed, in the latter play, so gracefully is the fact covered up, we almost forget that the gentle and attractive Margaret is wooed and won by the man who at first tried to procure her for the lust of his prince; and the magnanimous prince is so magnanimous that his deliberate and well-laid plans against the honor of the fair maid of Fressingfield, and his threats against Lacy's life when thwarted in his purpose, are as pleasantly passed by in silence. Peele, on the contrary, never allows his readers to lose sight of "the old tragic principle of the consequences of sin." Nowhere is this more clearly exemplified than in *Lochrine*.

#### NATURE OF THEME, OR PLOT.

If any contrast between Greene and *Lochrine* and Peele were needed, it would be furnished by a study of the two sets of dramas. Mr. Courthope has said of Greene that

He was meant by nature for a novelist rather than for a playwright. His fancy, graceful, pastoral, and tender, is most at home when it is dwelling amid sheepfolds, and on the downs of Arcadia. . . . His softer nature appears in the construction of his plots, which abound in tragic incidents, but invariably end happily. . . . He kills his "dramatis personæ" plentifully, but casually. . . . What is best and most characteristic in the plays of Greene is the poetry of his pastoral landscape and his representation of the characters of women.<sup>1</sup>

And I should add to this his representation of such pastoral and idyllic scenes as are found in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *James IV.* The pretty and graceful love stories in these two plays, represented respectively by Margaret and Lacy and by Ida and Eustace, are very characteristic of the genius of Greene. Ulrici calls *James IV.* a romance, and *Alphonsus* a romantic and fantastic structure; of *Orlando Furioso* he says, "the reader is met by a refreshing breath of native air;" *George-a-Greene* is "pervaded by a tone of homely cheerfulness;" and *Friar Bacon*

<sup>1</sup>COURTHOPE, *A History of English Poetry* (London, 1897), Vol. II, pp. 394, 395.

and *Friar Bungay* by "a breath of pure, fresh air, a bright harmonious colouring."<sup>1</sup>

To such work as this, *Locrine*, *Edward I.*, and the *Battle of Alcazar* form a strong contrast. There is only here and there the merest touch of tenderness—the fate of Joan perhaps in *Edward I.*, or Sabren in *Locrine*, touches our sympathy—but no real impression is made. There is little play of the fancy; little, if anything, that is graceful or pastoral in the three plays. Even the would-be Robin Hood scenes in *Edward I.* have an unpleasant grimness about them—an evident unreality—that leaves them unconvincing and unattractive. No "refreshing breath of native air" blows over them. Whether because of the Marlowesque influence, or because of a deepening sense of the tragedy of the life he and his fellow-dramatists were leading, or because of misfortunes in his own life, or because of all these reasons, Peele's genius seems to have lost much of the sweetness and grace of his earlier *Arraignment of Paris* and his *David and Bethsabe*, although even in the latter indications of a change are discernible. In the three plays mentioned there is no uncertainty in the tragic development and outcome. Most especially in *Locrine*—and I think of this as the last of the three—is this feeling of the tragic outcome of events apparent. Throughout the play there is a consistent reiteration of the idea: "That all our life is but a tragedy" (pp. 70, 101). The deeply pathetic lines in "The Honour of the Garter" (II, 321), which Peele wrote in 1593—

I laid me down, laden with many cares,  
(My bed-fellows almost those twenty years),

inevitably suggest to my mind such lines as these from *Locrine*:

Caves were my beds, and stones my pillowberes,  
Fear was my sleep, and horror was my dream.

—P. 93.

No human strength, no work can work my weal,  
Care in my heart so tyrant-like doth deal.

—P. 103.

O life, the harbour of calamities!  
O death, the haven of all miseries!

—P. 87.

<sup>1</sup> ULRICI, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, trans. by SCHMITZ, Vol. I, p. 144.

## CHARACTERIZATION.

"Peele," says Carpenter, to repeat something we have quoted before,<sup>1</sup> "was in fact a poet rather than a dramatist, and it is by his poetical gifts alone that he attained his slender measure of success." Says Professor Courthope:

In wealth of poetic diction, warmth of fancy, and richness of invention, he perhaps excelled all his contemporaries whose names are usually coupled with his own. But in the higher creative powers he was deficient. His plays contain no character that rouses the affection; no imaginative situation that awakens the interest; no universal sentiment that touches the heart.<sup>2</sup>

After much reading and study of Peele's plays and *Locrine* I cannot but subscribe to the above statements in respect to both. No well-defined impression of any one character in *Locrine* or in any of Peele's known plays is fixed on my mind, no definite and positive appeal has been made by any character to my interest. The beginnings or intimations of such an awakening of interest are there, but they are shadowy and indistinct. No one character emerges from this shadowy background of indistinctness and stands out as a real and living personality with an appeal to our sympathy or to our dislike. Aside from their historical significance, the interest in the plays for the reader consists entirely, as has been said, in their poetical qualities. On the Elizabethan stage the appeal must have been largely through the action and the bloodthirsty rant so acceptable to the audience at that period of the development of the drama. I can see no difference in dramatic characterization between *Locrine* and the undoubted plays of Peele. The treatment is the same: in both it is marked by lack of discrimination, by lack of appeal. When the situation demands the expression of greatness or sublimity, of power, or of strong emotion, the author generally falls into bombast. There are touches of dignity, and now and then a suggestion of tenderness, but only a suggestion. In the representation of Oenone (*A. of P.*), Bethsabe (*D. & B.*), Joan (*Ed. I.*), and Sabren (*Locrine*), the softer appeal of Peele is felt, but only for a moment, not in a lasting or well-defined impression. The char-

<sup>1</sup> P. 8.<sup>2</sup> *History of English Poetry*, Vol. II, p. 401.

acters in *Locrine*, it is now needless to say, are certainly the kind Peele would create. They are marked by all his faults, they have no virtues of dramatic characterization his do not possess.

In this connection a last word concerning Greene. His characters are not unusual, but in distinctness and definiteness of impression he is undeniably Peele's superior. Saintsbury calls Margaret (*F. B. & F. B.*) "by far the most human heroine produced by any of Greene's own group."<sup>1</sup> One of the greatest charms of Greene's dramas is his representation of women, loving, virtuous, constant. They are very far from creations in the sense that Shakspeare's women are, but yet the definite and positive impression is made, and the graceful and attractive image remains in our memory. Dorothea, the unfortunate queen of James IV., Ida, the countess' daughter, and Margaret, the fair maid of Fressingfield, are examples of Greene's power to draw attractive female characters. Other characters having distinctness of form and possessing interest in themselves beyond any in *Locrine* or Peele are Friar Bacon, Nano, the dwarf, Eustace, the lover of Ida, and perhaps Ateukin, the parasite of James. In the nature of its character-drawing alone, *Locrine* is impossible as the work of Robert Greene.

#### RESEMBLANCES OF THOUGHT AND PHRASING.

In various points of style, in versification, in the nature and treatment of theme, and in characterization, we have found a constant similarity between *Locrine* and the undoubted plays of Peele. Usually, with an agreement established in all these tests, the case is good. I purpose to make it stronger by the citation of some of the more striking of the many parallel passages in *Locrine* and Peele's undoubted plays and poems. Indeed, the fact that striking parallels exist between *Locrine* and practically all Peele's plays and poems, showing repetitions of thought and language throughout his entire career, is in itself almost enough—even if the other tests were not convincing—to prove that this mutual dependence is due to the fact of Peele's authorship. But, however important or unimportant parallel passages may be when

<sup>1</sup> *History of Elizabethan Literature* (London, and New York, 1887), pp. 73, 74.



put forward alone, I feel that when they support and confirm all the tests already applied, none of which has failed, the case for Peele's authorship is more than made good.

Before I cite these parallel passages, I wish to say that it was no uncommon thing for Peele thus to repeat himself—in fact, that all his plays and poems show repetitions of thought and language. Sometimes the exact language of entire lines is repeated. I regret that lack of space forbids my giving the examples of his habit I have collected.

The following are some of the parallel passages between Peele's undoubted work and *Lochrine*:

- 1 To arms, to arms, to honourable arms!  
—*Tale of Troy*, Vol. II, p. 239.  
Your rests and muskets take, take helm and targe.  
—P. 237.  
To arms, my lord, to honourable arms:  
Take helm and targe in hand.  
—*Lochrine*, p. 81.
- 2 With slaughtering hand, with visage pale and dim.  
—*T. of T.*, II, p. 263.  
Black ugly Death, with visage pale and wan.  
—*Lochrine*, p. 60.
- 3 Yet policy,  
The sinews and true strength of chivalry.  
—*T. of T.*, II, 259.  
For policy, join'd with chivalry,  
Can never be put back from victory.  
—*Lochrine*, 74.
- 4 Yet chivalry will mount with golden wings.  
—*Eclogue Grat.*, II, 275.  
The Trojans' glory flies with golden wings.  
—*Lochrine*, 61.
- 5 That Absalom may glut his longing soul.  
—*David and Bathsheba*, II, 58.  
And now revenge shall glut my longing soul.  
—*Lochrine*, 81.
- 6 Alas, my veins are numb'd, my sinews shrink,  
My blood is pierced (iced ?).<sup>1</sup>  
—*Old Wives' Tale*, I, 342.

<sup>1</sup> Emendation by P. A. DANIEL. See BULLEN's *Peele*, Vol. I, p. 342, note.

My sinews shrink, my numbed senses fail,  
A chilling cold possesseth all my bones.

—*Locrine*, 60.

- 7 Why, how now, princex! prat'st thou to a king?

—*Edward I.*, I, 181.

What, prat'st thou, peasant, to thy sovereign?

—*Locrine*, 95.

A resemblance principally of thought, but with many words repeated:

- 8 Great Jove, defender of this ancient town,  
Descended of the Trojan Brutus line,

\* \* \* \* \*

Whose pure renown hath pierced the world's large ears,  
In golden scrolls rolling about the heavens.

—*Descensus Ast.*, I, 361.

The Trojans' glory flies with golden wings,

\* \* \* \* \*

The fame of Brutus and his followers  
Pierceth the skies, and, with the skies, the throne  
Of mighty Jove, commander of the world.

—*Locrine*, 61.

Cf.:

Yet chivalry will mount with golden wings,  
Spite all, and nestle near the seat of kings.

—*Eclogue Grat.*, II, 275.

- 9 The combat will I crave upon thy ghost,  
And drag thee through the loathsome pools  
Of Lethes, Styx, and fiery Phlegethon.

—*Battle of A.*, I, 289.

I'll drag thy cursed ghost  
Through all the rivers of foul Erebus.

—*Locrine*, 86.

- 10 Mounted upon his jennet white as snow.

—*Battle of A.*, I, 291.

Mounted upon his courser white as snow.

—*Locrine*, 73.

- 11 Where shall I find some unfrequented place,  
Some uncouth walk, where I may curse my fill,  
My stars, my dam, my planets, and my nurse,  
The fire, the air, the water, and the earth.

—*Battle of A.*, I, 287, 288.

Where may I find some desert wilderness,  
 Where I may breathe out curses as I would,  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 Where may I find some hollow uncouth rock,  
 Where I may damn, condemn, and ban my fill,  
 The heavens, the hell, the earth, the air, the fire.

— *Locrine*, 85.

- 12 Pisano, take a cornet of our horse,  
 As many argolets and armed pikes.

— *Battle of A.*, I, 233.

Hubba, go take a coronet of our horse,  
 As many lancers, and light-armed knights.

— *Locrine*, 74.

Here are parallelisms between *Locrine* and four of Peele's plays and three of his poems. We know that he often borrowed from, or repeated, himself. It would be unreasonable to suppose that any other poet could copy so extensively from all these poems and plays. It is reasonable to conclude, and, in view of the other evidence already given, it is almost the inevitable conclusion, that Peele here as elsewhere is simply repeating himself in his own play *Locrine*.

W. S. GAUD.

NEW YORK CITY.

## THE MORAL ELEMENT IN GOTTFRIED'S *TRISTAN* UND *ISOLDE*.

FEW poems of German literature have given rise to so various and contradictory opinions as has Gottfried's *Tristan und Isolde*. Virtually all critics agree as to the beauty of the descriptions and the mastery of the niceties of style. The melodious flow of the verse, the limpid beauty of the language, and his surprising power of psychological analysis have earned for Gottfried the title of a master of his art and a high rank among German poets of any age. Few writers have excelled him in the ability to paint the conflicting emotions of the heart under the stress of an overpowering passion. Many of the older critics, however, rendered their tribute of praise almost in spite of themselves, for all this manifold beauty was in their minds only the attractive cloak for gross immorality and excited only aversion and disgust. The severe condemnation which the legend received at the hands of the poet Southey, for example, is too well known to need more than a passing mention.<sup>1</sup> His attitude is pardonable when one remembers that he was acquainted with the tale only in the crude, unpolished English version of *Sir Tristrem*. One is, however, surprised at the harsh criticism passed on Gottfried's poem by so able and, as a rule, so just a critic as Karl Lachmann, who said of it: "anderes als äppigkeit oder gotteslästerung boten die haupttheile seiner weichlichen, unsittlichen erzählung nicht dar."<sup>2</sup> Massmann likewise, in his edition of Gottfried, expressed himself in terms hardly less severe.<sup>3</sup> Groote,<sup>4</sup> who was one of the first to protest against the severe criticism of the poem, tried to condone the sin of the lovers by declaring that Isolde was married to Marke only in appearance and that Tristan was her real husband. In this he was followed by Simrock in his translation of Gott-

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *The Byrth, Lyf and Actes of Kyng Arthur*, etc. (London, 1817), Vol. I, p. xv.

<sup>2</sup> LACHMANN, *Auswahl aus den mhd. Dichtern des 13. Jh.*, p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. xi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the introduction to his edition of GOTTFRIED'S *Tristan* (Berlin, 1821), p. xvi.

fried.<sup>1</sup> That this view, however, is untenable, everyone who has read the poem attentively is well aware. Later critics, therefore, have contented themselves in the main with emphasizing the fact that Gottfried has taken a story of crime and low intrigue and transformed it into a poem of surpassing beauty. This is true enough, although much of the credit for doing this belongs in all probability to Gottfried's source, the French poet Thomas. This evidence is, however, largely æsthetic in character, and is not valid in the sphere of morality. The proofs must be sought rather in the motive which inspired the author, and in the difference of attitude on questions of morality and custom existing between mediæval and modern times. It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to consider the subject from these two points of view, to institute an inquiry into Gottfried's motive in writing the poem, to investigate his method of depicting the love scenes and his attitude toward the legend, and lastly to bring as much light to bear upon his conceptions of honor and virtue as may be gleaned from what he himself tells us in the poem.

Taking up first the question of motive, it will be generally admitted, I think, that in the realm of literature this is a prime factor in deciding questions of morality. It is not so much the incidents narrated, but the way in which they are told and the purpose animating the author, which form the final court of appeal. The historian or the literary artist may deal with the most delicate subjects, if his purpose be to instruct or admonish. To select only one of the many examples which suggest themselves to the mind: the so-called problem plays of modern literature may be disagreeable, they may depict a side of life whose existence we would gladly deny, but only a complete misconception of their purpose can lead us to call them immoral. When, however, a writer becomes purposely suggestive, when the motive is no longer to point a moral, but to appeal to depraved tastes, to excite the senses by veiled allusions or by detailed descriptions of erotic scenes, then we are forced to admit that he has been guilty of immorality which no art, however skilful, will excuse.

When we consider Gottfried's poem from this point of view,

<sup>1</sup> P. 395.

we find that it belongs to the first category. It is the narrative of an overpowering passion from which it is impossible for the victims to escape, which overthrows the barriers of honor and virtue, renders the lovers miserable despite their love, and finally leads to their tragic death. That Tristan was predestined for such a life of sinful love is clearly pointed out by Gottfried. Had the poet lived in the nineteenth century, he would have talked a great deal about environment and inherited predispositions. Having had the misfortune of being born over six hundred years before Darwin and the modern scientific school, he did what was virtually the same thing—he gave the detailed history of Tristan's parents to show that he was predestined for such a life by being a child of love. Furthermore, when the name Tristan is given to the hero, Gottfried comments upon its appropriateness, deriving it from the French *triste*. "Behold," he exclaims, "what a sad life was given to him to live!"<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, the poet did not live to complete his work, but we know from the English *Sir Tristrem* and the Norse saga how Thomas finished the story, and there is not the slightest doubt but that Gottfried would have ended the poem in a way which would have made it perfectly clear that the tragic death of the lovers was the necessary consequence of their sin, and the atonement for it. In fact, he indicates this in ll. 2011–15, where he remarks:

Sehet an den trûreclîchen tût,  
der alle sîne herzenôt  
mit einem ende beslôz,  
daz alles tôdes übergênôz  
und aller triuwe ein galle was;

"a death which surpassed all other deaths and which contained more bitterness than any other sorrow." This passage occurs near the beginning in the description of Tristan's christening and strikes at once the keynote of the whole poem.

Gottfried's purpose is, therefore, to depict the course and the tragic consequences of a sinful love. In no case does he endeavor to present this love in an attractive or alluring light—quite the contrary. Toward the end of the poem his comments upon honor

<sup>1</sup> "Sehen wie trûreclîch ein leben  
Ime zo lebene wart gegeben" (l. 2009).

and virtue in women become more and more frequent. It is as if he felt his end approaching and did not wish to leave the world in doubt as to his attitude toward the story. Thus, after Tristan is banished from Marke's court, the poet remarks that no good woman would give up her honor to save her life.<sup>1</sup> A few lines farther he adds: "There is no more beautiful thing in the world than a woman who is devoted to *māze* [i. e., moderation]. The man who is loved by such a woman is the possessor of every earthly joy and carries a living paradise in his heart. He has no cause for anxiety and need not desire to exchange his life for that of Tristan, for a faithful wife does more for her husband than ever Isolde did for Tristan."<sup>2</sup> Surely no words could express more clearly the critical, nay condemnatory, attitude of the poet toward the legend. Again, in another passage, just after the lovers have yielded to their fatal passion, he moralizes at some length upon infidelity in love. "We have a false conception of love," he tells us. "We sow weeds and expect roses and lilies to spring up, and this cannot be; we must reap what we sow. We sow love with falseness and dishonesty, and so it bears only evil and pain. Real love has been banished and we have naught but the name."<sup>3</sup>

Let us now turn to the consideration of the second point, that of method, and inquire how Gottfried has treated the love scenes in the poem. This, as has already been brought out, is of the greatest importance in judging of the morality of a piece of literature, for it gives us additional and important evidence as to the motive of the author. The question in Gottfried's case is doubly important, since the character of the story is such that a poet who delights in depicting scenes of passion has ample opportunity in the course of the narrative to indulge his bent to the full.<sup>4</sup> A study of Gottfried's poem from this point of view reveals at once the fact that the poet observes the utmost delicacy in dealing with erotic situations. He introduces love scenes only where he cannot avoid them without departing from the story, and when he does introduce them, it is done so simply, so charmingly, that we

<sup>1</sup> L. 18000.

<sup>2</sup> Ll. 18101-12.

<sup>3</sup> Ll. 12230-12361.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., for example, SWINBURNE's treatment of the legend in his *Tristram of Lyonesse*.



cannot take offense.<sup>1</sup> Take, for example, the love scene between Tristan's Rivalin and Blancheflour. It was necessary for the poet to describe this scene in some detail in order to show that Tristan was a child of love. Here was a chance to indulge in description of the most erotic character. But what do we find? A scene so artless and so touching in its simplicity and delicacy that one must search far to find its equal. Overcome by her grief at Rivalin's supposedly fatal wound, Blancheflour falls in a swoon upon the edge of his couch. Her sweet presence revives in the dying hero the almost extinct spark of life. Their lips meet in kisses and then the poet adds simply:

dâ nach so was vil harte unlanc,  
unz daz ir beider wille ergie,  
und daz vil süeze wip enpfie  
ein kint von sinem libe.

—Ll. 1320-23.

So much was necessary, as stated, to show the character of Tristan's conception; the rest is left to the imagination of the reader. Here there is certainly no attempt at passionate, or even suggestive, description, and yet this is the most detailed of all the love scenes of the poem. What would not a Wieland or a Byron or a d'Annunzio have made of this episode?

Further, when after drinking the fatal potion Tristan and Isolde have confessed their mutual love and Brangaene consents to provide them with an opportunity to meet rather than see her mistress pine away, and Tristan steals softly to Isolde's darkened cabin, we should expect of a mediæval poet a most detailed description of the scene. Gottfried, however, merely relates how the physician Love took the lovesick Tristan by the hand and led him to the bedside of Isolde and gave him to her and her to him as medicine. Love bound their hearts so firmly, he tells us, that they could never be severed.<sup>2</sup> Then, instead of describing

<sup>1</sup> For some of the following examples I am indebted in the first instance to R. HEINZEL, "Über Gottfried von Strassburg" (*Zeitschr. f. d. Österreich. Gym.*, 1868), pp. 548, 549, who collected a number of instances. J. FIRMERY, in an essay, "Notes critiques sur quelques traductions allemandes de poèmes français au moyen âge," *Annales de l'université de Lyon*, nouvelle série, II, 8, has also emphasized the delicacy with which Gottfried treats the love scenes in his poem. Not having access to this series, I am unable to say how fully Firmery has treated of this point.

<sup>2</sup> Ll. 12161-96.

the scene further, he begins a long rambling discussion of two hundred lines on the character and the effects of love, in the course of which he condemns a passion based upon treachery and deceit, and sings the praises of a love coupled with fidelity. When he finally returns to the lovers, it is only to remark that they succeeded in curing one another of their sorrow and pain.<sup>1</sup>

Again, no incident in the poem has given more offense than the substitution of Brangaene for Isolde. This is not the place to justify its introduction, as we are concerned here only with Gottfried's method of treatment. Suffice it to say that he found the incident in the original, and that it seemed to offer the only way by which Brangaene might save the reputation of her mistress and make good her negligence which had brought upon the lovers their fatal passion. Now how does Gottfried treat so difficult a scene? Brangaene at first refuses thus to debase herself and consents only after repeated urging, and because she feels that she must pay the penalty of her carelessness and at any cost save the honor of Isolde, for whose happiness the queen had made her responsible. There is no detailed description of the scene. The poet hastens to assure us that Brangaene's thoughts were "läter unde guot," and that she slipped away as soon as the object of the substitution had been accomplished.<sup>2</sup>

In the other recorded instances of meetings between the lovers Gottfried contents himself, as a rule, with the mere mention of the fact, as, for example, in the series of rendezvous in the orchard during Marke's absence. Here we read merely that they met without detection eight times in as many days.<sup>3</sup> In the beautiful idyl of the *Minnegrotte* we find lengthy descriptions of nature, of the arrangement of the grotto, of the manner in which the lovers passed their days, but not even the mention of a love scene, although the opportunity to introduce such a passage could not

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 12362 ff.

<sup>2</sup> In no case does Gottfried indulge in ribald jokes upon delicate situations, as do the later French versions of the legend. The attitude of the latter has been well shown by Heinzel with reference to the scene where Tristan, disguised as a pilgrim, stumbles and falls when carrying Isolde ashore. A comparison with the corresponding passages in the saga and the English poem also shows that the humor in Thomas must have been much broader, and furnishes additional evidence in proof of Gottfried's desire to avoid coarse and indelicate expressions.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ll. 14506-10.

have been more favorable. Had Gottfried been fond of indulging in erotic descriptions, he would not have allowed so favorable a chance to pass unused.<sup>1</sup>

Judged, therefore, from the standpoints of motive and method, Gottfried must be exonerated from much of the blame attached to him. There are still some objections, however, which remain to be answered. Chief among these is the fact that the poet does not directly pose as a moralist and that he does not censure the lovers more severely. It has been pointed out that Marke, the deluded husband, plays the part of a stupid fool who deserves to be deceived for his credulity, and that those who act as spies upon the lovers are not represented as champions of morality, but are accused of a lack of courtly breeding (*unhövescheit*). This is to some extent true, but it does not prove Gottfried's frivolity as conclusively as has been claimed. Those who make this criticism quite forget that a piece of literature must be judged from the viewpoint of the time and place in which it was written. Not only customs, but also the conceptions of honor and virtue, vary from age to age and may be different in different parts of the world, or in different classes of society.<sup>2</sup>

The people of the Middle Ages, and especially those classes among whom chivalry took its rise had a more naïve way of looking at things than we today. Their ideals were often totally different from ours and resembled more those of the ancient world. The moral value of absolute truthfulness does not seem to have been appreciated by them any more than by the Greeks, who admired above all things craftiness and cunning. Tristan of our poem is just such a character as Ulysses or Pylades. With a quiet smile on his lips and with an ingenuity which astonishes us, he invents again and again the most plausible stories to account for the condition in which he found himself at a given moment.

<sup>1</sup> In one case, it must be admitted, Gottfried does seem to depart from his usual practice, when he describes the position in which Marke discovers the lovers asleep in the garden, ll. 18199-18218. This admits, however, of an easy explanation. Just as an unusual amount of detail was given in the love scene between Rivalin and Blanche flour to show the nature of Tristan's conception, so here too Gottfried probably felt it necessary to describe the scene in such a way that Marke should have at last unequivocal proof of the character of the intercourse existing between his wife and his nephew.

<sup>2</sup> A strong presentation of these facts in dramatic form is to be found in SUDERMANN'S *Ehre*.

Thus, when he had been carried off by Norwegian traders and landed on an unknown coast, he tells the pilgrims whom he meets that he had lost his way while hunting in the neighborhood. Not only does he invent the story, but he describes the circumstances with such minutiae that he is at once believed. That we are expected to admire him for his ready invention is evident from the words with which the episode is introduced.<sup>1</sup> Again, on his second trip to Ireland Tristan goes boldly on shore, although he knows that the Irish have sworn to kill all men from Kurneval, trusting to his skill in deceiving to preserve him from harm. He makes no pretense of concealing his purpose from his fellow-travelers, but says frankly: "I must lie to them today to the extent of my ability."<sup>2</sup> Such examples occur frequently, and might be largely multiplied if space would permit.<sup>3</sup>

That not only Gottfried, but also his contemporaries, justified such deceit is shown by the fact that Tristan was universally considered as a model of courtly breeding. As strict a moralist as Thomasin von Zirclære holds him up as a pattern for the young to follow.<sup>4</sup> Similar characters are found in the *Iwein* of Hartman von Aue, whom Gottfried took as his model. Thus the waiting maid Lunette and the young squire, who successfully deceived their mistress and induced her to marry the hero, are highly extolled.<sup>5</sup> Further, the maid who cured Iwein of his madness is called wise because she tells a falsehood (*lügenmaere*) to account for the disappearance of the salve used in the cure.<sup>6</sup>

Another feature in which the age of chivalry differed from modern times, and which has a still closer bearing upon the question of Gottfried's morality, was the stress laid upon the strict observance of a formal courtly etiquette (*hövescheit*). Provided a man followed its dictates to the letter, other qualities were of little importance. This was, after all, only natural, for it was courtly breeding which had gradually transformed the semi-barbarous western lands into a semblance of culture and civiliza-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ll. 2690 f.

<sup>2</sup> Ll. 8709, 8710.

<sup>3</sup> Other examples are found: ll. 3079 ff.; 7905-14; 8185-8212; 8800 ff. In one case the poet goes out of his way to show the advantages of such forethought, as he calls it.

<sup>4</sup> *Der welsche Gast*, I. 1051: "an gevuoc folgt ir Tristande."

<sup>5</sup> Ll. 2181-84 and 2218.

<sup>6</sup> Ll. 3357 ff.

tion. It alone distinguished often the knight from the *vilein* or boor, the noble of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries from his warlike but uncouth ancestors. The courtly poets are, therefore, continually using the phrase *durch hövescheit* in commenting upon the fine breeding of their heroes.<sup>1</sup> Even more popular epics, such as the *Nibelungenlied*, make similar use of it.<sup>2</sup> Now, one of the worst infringements of this formal etiquette is tale-bearing. No matter what happened, courtly etiquette demanded that a knight should be able to hold his tongue. The poems of the minnesingers are full of severe condemnation of the envious *merkaere*, who disturbed the peace of lovers. Gottfried, we find, takes the same view. He accuses the knight Marjodo and the dwarf Melot, who betray Tristan to Marke, of *unhövescheit* and scores them in no measured terms. He begins chap. 24 with a long homily on the despicableness of false friendship in general and that of Marjodo in particular, and even goes so far as to call the knight a dog and the dwarf a serpent, although he usually avoids such expressions as being uncourtly. We find Eilhart taking exactly the same view in his version. In fact, he waxes still more indignant at the "boorishness" of the knight, whom he calls a coward (*zage*), and whom he wishes the devil would drown in the Rhine for his false friendship toward Tristan. His statements are called *nidesch lügenmære*, although they are only too true.<sup>3</sup>

Still another conception which we must thoroughly understand in order to avoid misjudging Gottfried's poem is the courtly use of the word *êre*, which seldom meant "honor" in the modern acceptance, but generally signified "reputation," the respect in which a person was held. Honor with us is mainly subjective;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Flore*, 3924; *Parzival*, III, 1611; *Iwein*, 788, 3387.

<sup>2</sup> *Nibelungenlied* (Lachmann), 131.

<sup>3</sup> LICHTENSTEIN's edition of EILHART, I. 3171. A most striking instance of the extent to which this etiquette was carried is furnished by the episode in which Isolde wins her case when subjected to the trial by hot iron by appealing to the *hövescheit* of God (ll. 15554 ff.). Gottfried has been accused of blasphemy because of this remark, but has been well defended by BECHSTEIN, in his Introduction, p. xxx, and by KURTZ, *Germania*, Vol. XV, pp. 207 ff. and 322 ff. Before Gottfried HARTMANN had already spoken of God's *hövescheit* (*Ercc.*, 3460), and the expression is also used by ULRICH VON LICHTENSTEIN (*Frauendienst*, 180, 8) and by ABRAHAM A SANTA CLARA (*Judas*, III, 27). Cf. SPRENGER, *Zeitschr. f. d. Phil.*, Vol. XXVI, p. 281, and HERTZ, *Tristan und Isolde*<sup>3</sup>, p. 544.

in the poems of chivalry it is principally objective.<sup>1</sup> It was synonymous with outward appearances, and so long as these were kept, *ère* was untarnished. This is clearly brought out in Gottfried's poem. When, for example, Isolde succeeds in triumphantly standing the test of the hot iron, the poet remarks that her *ère* was restored,<sup>2</sup> whereas from a modern point of view the deceit to which she had recourse dishonored her more than ever. Again, when the lovers are banished from the court, they do not grieve on account of their guilt toward Marke, but solely because the discovery of their sinful love had brought upon them the loss of their reputation at the court.<sup>3</sup> And when Marke concludes to take them back into favor, they rejoice especially over their restoration to *ère*.<sup>4</sup>

Most characteristic for the courtly conception of honor is the attitude of the lovers after drinking the love potion. The thought that it would be more honorable to accept the consequences of their love does not seem to have occurred to them. In their minds it was decidedly less dishonorable to deceive Marke than to cause a public scandal. Tristan had promised to obtain the hand of Isolde for his uncle, and this promise must be kept or he would be dishonored, i. e., would lose his *ère*. The poet does not leave us in the slightest doubt as to which was the correct course for Tristan to pursue. Line 12511 he remarks:

swie sanfte uns mit der liebe si,  
so müezen wir doch ie dā bi  
gedenken der éren.

Again, a few lines farther down (12517-22) he continues:

swie wol Tristande tæte  
daz leben, daz er hæte,  
sin ére zôch in doch dervan.

<sup>1</sup> Of sixty-eight occurrences in *Iwein* only one cannot be construed in an objective sense (l. 3046), and in scarcely more than a half-dozen cases is it used as we now employ the word.

<sup>2</sup> "Das si an ir éren genas" (l. 15754).

<sup>3</sup> "Sine haeten umbe ein bezzer leben  
niht eine bône gegeben,  
wan eine umbe ir ére" (ll. 16879-81).

<sup>4</sup> "Die fröude heten s'aber dô  
vil harter unde mére  
dur got und durch ir ére" (ll. 17700-17702).

sin triuwe lag im allez an,  
daz er ir wol gedæhte  
und Marke sin wip bræhte.<sup>1</sup>

Love and honor are in conflict, and although the former had conquered before, now honor is triumphant and love is forced to give way for the time being. A modern poet would have treated the subject in the very opposite manner. He would have shown that true honor demanded above all absolute truthfulness, and would have made Tristan confess to Marke the secret of his love, and either allowed him to suffer the consequences of betraying the king's confidence, or, if the story was to end happily, would have made Marke magnanimous enough to pardon Tristan's fault and renounce all claims to Isolde.<sup>2</sup> Gottfried, however, is a child of his time, and we cannot expect him to exhibit feelings and hold ideals different from those of his contemporaries. It is, therefore, unjust to call him immoral because he places *êre*, i. e., reputation, above absolute truthfulness.

Another characteristic difference existing between modern times and the age of chivalry which must be borne in mind in judging of Gottfried's poem is to be found in the attitude toward the passion of love. Civilization was cruder, men were more naïve in those days, and their passions were not held in check by considerations of propriety and of society as in our time. Love was supreme, and few ties, however sacred, could stand before it. The many *tagelieder* of the Middle High German and the *albas* of Provençal literature are not creations of a depraved morality, but expressions of the belief that love carried with it its own justification under all circumstances. The prevailing custom of marrying young girls, often against their will, for family or state reasons to men whom they often had never seen had resulted in the

<sup>1</sup> This whole chapter throws most interesting light on the conceptions of *êre* and *triuwe*.

<sup>2</sup> IMMERMANN attempted to modernize the legend in this way by having the lovers prepare to commit suicide before landing. He, however, shrank from the complete change in the story which this would involve, so that his attempt remained half-hearted and ineffectual. JOSEPH WEILLEN is the only one, so far as I know, who has consistently modernized the poem by having the lovers struggle successfully against their passion until Tristan can leave the court. Weillen, however, spoils his drama by the unnecessarily tragic character of the close. The difficulties attending the remodeling of the legend for modern dramatic purposes have been interestingly discussed by BECHSTEIN, *Tristan und Isolde in den deutschen Dichtungen der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1876).



gradual degradation of marriage. The question as to whether love could exist between husband and wife we find being discussed and gravely decided in the negative.<sup>1</sup> The frequent lack of congeniality led husband and wife to bestow their affections elsewhere. Such secret love naturally attracted the adventurous spirit of the knights, and the prudence and cunning necessary to escape detection possessed a similar charm for the woman of leisure.<sup>2</sup> The result was that violations of the marriage tie were not considered so heinous nor were they so severely punished as in a stricter age.

An interesting example of this is to be found in MS R of Raimbaut de Vaqueiras's poem *Carros*, where the marquis finds his wife asleep in the arms of the troubadour, much as Marke discovers Tristan and Isolde. Instead of avenging his honor on the spot, the marquis merely substitutes his cloak for that of Raimbaut, as Marke does with the swords in the grotto scene, and leaves the lovers undisturbed. When the troubadour awakes and sees that he has been detected, he proceeds at once to the injured husband and begs his pardon. This the latter grants, with the remark that he forgave the theft this time, but that it must not occur again. Such indifference on the part of the marquis seems incredible to us. It offers, however, a most striking parallel to our poem, and at the same time a commentary on the lack of spirit which Marke exhibits.

The susceptibility of woman to love is the favorite theme of the troubadours. Arnaut Daniel once declared that there was no woman who did not wish to yield and who would not, if rightly wooed.<sup>3</sup> It was considered wrong, however, to yield lightly to the solicitations of the lover. Eilhart expresses this view clearly when he makes one of Isolde's ladies-in-waiting indignantly spurn the advances of Kehenis.<sup>4</sup> Gottfried likewise is far from being an apostle of indiscriminate love. If, however, love already exists between a man and a woman, if it has proved too strong

<sup>1</sup> "Utrum inter conjugales amor possit habere locum?" MS de la Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 8758, fol. 56. Cf. MARY LAFON, *Histoire littéraire du Midi de la France* (Paris, 1882), p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. JUSTIN H. SMITH, *The Troubadours at Home*, p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>4</sup> LICHTENSTEIN's edition, II. 6742 ff.

for them, if they have been forced to surrender to their passion, then it is foolish to have further scruples in the matter. This is the feeling of the age of chivalry, and Gottfried makes this clear when he remarks, that those who have gone so far that all strangeness between them has ceased to exist are thieves of their own happiness if they do not give themselves over to the enjoyment of their love.<sup>1</sup> This is such a matter of course for Gottfried that he wastes no further words upon it. The intrigues and deceit necessary to procure the enjoyment of this love he considers deplorable, but nevertheless justifiable. If, then, love be thought to be an overpowering passion to which everyone must yield whom it makes its prey;<sup>2</sup> if, moreover, it be so supreme that no obligation, however binding, can stand before it, then the actions of Tristan and Isolde are certainly less reprehensible from this point of view than when judged by our moral standard. From the standpoint of courtly chivalry, Gottfried's Tristan is in many respects the ideal lover, devoted to his mistress and faithful to the end.<sup>3</sup> He is no gay, wanton butterfly fluttering from one flower to another, but a man whose whole life is filled with this one passion—his love for Isolde.

Whatever, therefore, may be the general opinion of the immorality of the legend in its cruder forms, it must be evident from the arguments adduced that no blame attaches to Gottfried, unless indeed we go so far as to censure him for choosing such a subject for poetic treatment. Granted, however, the right to select such a theme—and no less a man than Goethe was a strong champion of the freedom of the poet in this respect—then we must concede that Gottfried has sought throughout to lift the tale out of the realm of the commonplace into the sphere of the ideal, that under his pen the story of a guilty passion becomes a grand picture of two souls struggling against an overpowering love, which draws them slowly but surely together and from which

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 12380-90.

<sup>2</sup> This is made clear by Gottfried in ll. 12180-86. In BEROL and EILHART the love ceases when the effect of the philter ceases; in GOTTFRIED it lasts till death.

<sup>3</sup> In EILHART Tristan's marriage with Isolde of Brittany finally becomes one in reality as well as in name. In the courtly version, however, he remains faithful to his first love. This trait of fidelity has been exquisitely portrayed by WILLIAM MORRIS in his treatment of this episode.

there is no possibility of escape—a love which renders its possessors, not happy, but miserable, and which finally ends in their tragic death. We have seen that the poet does not hold the lovers up as examples for us to imitate; on the contrary, he pauses again and again to sing the praises of virtue and moderation (*mâze*) in woman. His views on honor and love, which differ so radically from ours, find their explanation in the attitude of the age of chivalry touching these points. His motive has been shown to be pure, and the evident intention to refrain from all mention of unpleasant or gross thoughts, and the delicacy with which scenes of the most intimate character are depicted, suffice finally to clear him of the least suspicion of immorality. With an unsurpassed beauty and melody of verse, with a marvelous knowledge of the human heart, and a searching analysis of motives and emotions, Gottfried has succeeded in giving us a poem which will stand for all time as one of the few great tragedies of love, and which must disarm criticism except on the part of those who fix their eyes obstinately on one point and thus fail to see the grandeur of the struggle and the beauty of the description which have placed the poem in the front rank of the literature of the world.

DANIEL BUSSIER SHUMWAY.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

## LES "DISCOURS" DE RONSARD.<sup>1</sup>

LA renommée de Ronsard, si glorieuse au temps de la Pléiade, s'écroula sous la critique aussi fameuse qu'injuste de Boileau.<sup>2</sup> Pendant deux siècles, elle ne s'en releva point. Au XIX<sup>e</sup> seulement, après l'heureuse initiative de Sainte-Beuve,<sup>3</sup> elle a repris quelque chose de son éclat d'antan. Les lettrés délicats l'ont relu. Mais qu'ont-ils admiré de son œuvre? Je crois bien que ce sont les folâtreries. Longtemps il éveilla l'idée d'un poète trop ambitieux—et c'est un souvenir de Boileau—puis d'un poète aimable, galant, épicurien. Il le fut sans doute, et c'est un titre de gloire, si l'on veut. Mais il en a un autre plus important à mes yeux: les *Discours*. Là, pour la première fois peut-être, il s'est montré grand poète, je veux dire inspiré par de belles et nobles idées, emporté par le souffle d'une poésie large, chaude, éloquente. Ce n'est pas une découverte que je fais. Après Sainte-Beuve, MM. Lenient, Bizos, Vianey, Pinvert<sup>4</sup> ont consacré aux *Discours* quelques pages judicieuses. M. Faguet<sup>5</sup> les a analysés de façon rapide et substantielle. Sous ce titre "Un épisode de la vie de Ronsard,"<sup>6</sup> M. Brunetière apprécie les opinions de Ronsard, en homme peut-être trop préoccupé des luttes contemporaines. Enfin, M. Perdrizet vient d'écrire sur *Ronsard et la Réforme* une étude intéressante sinon définitive.<sup>7</sup> Aux uns, Ronsard apparaît un champion convaincu du trône et de l'autel; aux autres un égoïste plus soucieux de bénéfices que de religion; à quelques-uns, plus modérés, un humaniste conservateur. Parmi ces critiques, MM. Brunetière et Perdrizet me paraissent avoir résumé les opinions diverses. Je voudrais ici exposer leurs raisons, les discuter, et, s'il y a lieu, proposer une opinion personnelle. La question a son importance. Non seulement les *Discours*

<sup>1</sup> Cette étude servira de préface à une édition critique des *Discours* que l'auteur prépare.

<sup>2</sup> *Art poétique*, chant i, vss. 123-30.

<sup>3</sup> *Tableau de la poésie au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Charpentier).

<sup>4</sup> *Satire en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, tome I; *Ronsard dans les Classiques populaires*; Thèse française sur Mathurin Régnier; Thèse française sur Jacques Grévin.

<sup>5</sup> *XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Études littéraires*, pp. 251-55.

<sup>6</sup> *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 mai 1900.

<sup>7</sup> *Ronsard et la Réforme* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1902).

nous font connaître un Ronsard penseur, orateur, polémiste, patriote, c'est-à-dire un Ronsard nouveau, ou tout au moins différent du poète des *Amours*; mais ils nous renseignent sur l'état d'esprit des auteurs de la Pléiade. A ne lire que les historiens de la littérature, on pourrait s'imaginer une réunion de purs artistes, un peu païens, détachés de tout ce qui n'est pas l'art. On serait loin du compte. Ils aimaient vraiment leur patrie—Joachim du Bellay passe même pour avoir introduit ce mot;<sup>1</sup> à l'occasion, ils ne dédaignaient pas de quitter les régions sereines de la poésie pour se mêler aux réalités de leur temps. En quoi ils se montraient vraiment humanistes, si l'humanisme signifie avant tout l'intelligence et l'amour de la vie. De plus, dans la lutte contre les Protestants, Ronsard, de l'aveu même de M. Perdrizet,<sup>2</sup> représente l'opinion de ses contemporains. Alors les *Discours* se parent encore d'un intérêt historique. Ils nous apprennent ce que pensaient à ce moment de crise la majorité des Français, ce qui les éloignait de la religion nouvelle. N'est-ce pas de quoi leur mériter une place à part et dans l'étude même des œuvres de Ronsard, et dans l'histoire générale des idées au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle?

Les *Discours*, parus d'abord en plaquettes, réimprimés de 1562 à 1564, furent publiés durant la première guerre civile. En suivant l'ordre de ces poèmes dans l'édition Blanchemain, voici leurs dates respectives:<sup>3</sup> Le *Discours des misères de ce temps*, dès novembre 1562; la *Continuation*, également en novembre 1562; l'*Institution pour l'adolescence du Roy*, en 1562, peut-être avant les deux *Discours*; l'*Élégie à Guillaume des Autels*, écrite probablement avant les troubles d'Amboise, réimprimée en 1562; le *Discours à Louis des Masures*, de 1560 comme la précédente élégie; la *Remonstrance au peuple de France*, en décembre 1562;<sup>4</sup> *Response aux injures et calomnies*, en avril 1563. Quant aux

<sup>1</sup> Il n'a que le mérite de l'avoir vulgarisé. Avant lui, on le trouve dans C. Grugot (1537), Étienne Dolet (1544), et Hugues Salet (1545). Quelques-uns en ont fait honneur à Alain Chartier; mais il n'est de ce poète que dans une édition de 1661 où le texte de ses œuvres a été rajouté (A. DEBBOULE, *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1901, pp. 688, 689).

<sup>2</sup> *Ronsard et la Réforme*, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Elles s'écartent des indications de Blanchemain dans son édition; elles concordent davantage avec celles de M. PERDRIZET, pp. 16-20, 105, 130, mais pas absolument; enfin elles sont conformes aux vues de M. LAUMONNIER, *Revue universitaire*, 15 février 1903, pp. 152-57, notes 2, 5, 7, 9, 4.1. On y trouvera une discussion précise, dont nous n'avons gardé que les résultats.

<sup>4</sup> En 1563, d'après M. PERDRIZET, p. 28.

événements qui inspirèrent ces poèmes, les voici de façon sommaire:<sup>1</sup> conjuration d'Amboise (1560), colloque de Poissy (1562), massacre de Vassy (1562), massacres de Languedoc et de Guyenne par Bl. de Montluc, massacres de Provence et du Dauphiné par le protestant des Adrets, siège de Rouen par Guise et les catholiques, siège de Paris par Condé et les protestants, bataille de Dreux où Guise fait prisonnier Condé (19 décembre 1562), assassinat de Guise à Orléans (18 février 1563), paix d'Amboise (12 mars 1563).

L'écho de ces divers épisodes retentit dans les *Discours*, et les vers qui jaillirent à leur contact, Ronsard les recueillit dans le 6<sup>e</sup> volume de l'édition collective de 1567, imprimée un peu avant la seconde guerre civile (le 4 avril). Le caractère de ces pièces est relativement modéré. En 1571, après la troisième guerre civile, Ronsard donne une autre édition collective, accrue de plusieurs poèmes parus en 1569 ou 1570, dont les principaux sont: un "Chant triomphal pour jouer sur la lyre," "Prière à Dieu pour la Victoire," "L'Hydre défait," "Les Éléments ennemis de l'Hydre." Un catholicisme farouche y palpite.<sup>2</sup> En 1572-73, en 1578, en 1584, d'autres éditions se succédèrent du vivant même de Ronsard. On y remarque des corrections d'ordre moral et d'ordre littéraire. Malgré leur intérêt, tant qu'elles ne constituent que de simples variantes, je les néglige ici, parce qu'elles ne changent pas le ton général de l'œuvre, ni l'ensemble des idées, ni la couleur des sentiments. Quant aux autres, susceptibles de modifier nos impressions, je les signalerai en temps et lieu. Du reste le lecteur en trouvera le détail dans les notes critiques de M. Laumonnier, amères pour Ronsard, mais utiles à l'érudition.<sup>3</sup> Rappelons enfin une édition posthume en 1587, sous les auspices de J. Galland et de Cl. Binet, exécuteurs testamentaires de Ron-

<sup>1</sup> LAUMONNIER. *op. cit.*, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Pour mieux éclairer la pensée de Ronsard, citons encore la pièce à "Catherine de Médicis," datée de 1564, et qui fait partie du "Boenge royal" (II, 2, édit. 1584); puis, une chanson satirique sur le colloque de Poissy (éd. BLANCHEMAIN, tome VIII, p. 133); tome III, pp. 333, 375, 376; tome VI, pp. 257-64; tome VII, pp. 185-87; tome VIII, pp. 105-9.

<sup>3</sup> J'emprunterai mes citations à l'édition BLANCHEMAIN, parce qu'elle suffit au but que je me suis proposé. Mais pour les professeurs et pour les étudiants qu'intéresserait une étude exacte du texte en lui-même, cette édition est insuffisante. Il en faut dire autant de l'édition BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES. Je leur conseillerais de les compléter l'une et l'autre par les notes de M. LAUMONNIER.

sard. C'est l'édition *ne varietur*, expression suprême de la pensée du poète. Car le privilège nous apprend<sup>1</sup> que les œuvres y contenues ont été "revues, corrigées et augmentées par l'auteur peu avant son trépas, et mises en leur ordre suivant ses mémoires et ses copies." De plus, Binet, dans la *Vie de Ronsard* qu'il a placée en tête de cette édition, assure "que cette dernière main de ses œuvres comme un testament porte sa volonté gravée, ainsi qu'il la lui avait recommandée inviolable."

Les *Discours* parurent donc sous la forme légère de pamphlets. Ronsard imitait les Protestants. Ils avaient compris de bonne heure que pour gagner les masses, il fallait aller à elles. Disputer à coups d'in-folio latins, cela n'avancait guère. Ils n'étaient lus que par les savants, et parmi eux les conquêtes sont difficiles. Les Réformés adoptèrent donc un genre de propagande, suivi plus tard par les Jansénistes. Ils traduisirent en français la Bible, les Psaumes; multiplièrent les *Catéchismes*, les *Boucliers de la Foi*, les *Bâtons de la Foi*, et autres écrits de polémique. Commodes par leurs dimensions, intelligibles aux plus humbles esprits, ils se répandirent parmi le peuple avec une merveilleuse rapidité. On peut voir dans le livre de M. Perdrizet<sup>2</sup> à quel point l'audace des colporteurs était ingénieuse et hardie. Ainsi, l'attrait du mystère, le goût du fruit défendu, la verve éloquente des auteurs assurèrent à ces libelles une vogue immense au grand détriment des catholiques. De ce côté, aucune réponse alerte. La comparaison entre eux et les Réformés devenait fâcheuse à leur cause. Alors, Ronsard se leva et conçut l'idée de ses *Discours*.<sup>3</sup> Créateur en France d'une poésie haute et nouvelle, le chef de la Pléiade ambitionna-t-il la gloire d'un défenseur de la foi? ou du moins a-t-il voulu joindre aux victoires passées un autre triomphe littéraire, et montrer au monde qu'en sa personne et dans tous les champs de culture humaine la Pléiade restait la grande rénovatrice des lettres? Peut-être; et après tout son ambition fut légitime. Mais il ne la déclare pas. Les mobiles qu'il proclame sont d'un ordre plus élevé :

<sup>1</sup> LAUMONNIER, *op. cit.*, pp. 151, 152.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. i, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ils suscitèrent contre lui une armée d'adversaires qui firent pleuvoir sur sa tête une grêle de pamphlets, témoignage d'ailleurs indubitable de sa force et de la crainte qu'il inspirait. Cf. PERDRIZET, chap. ii, pp. 21 sqq.



Or, quand Paris avait sa muraille assiégée,  
 Et que la guerre était en ses faux-bourgs logée,  
 Et que les morions et les glaives trenchants  
 Reluisaient en la ville et reluisaient aux champs,  
 Voyant le laboureur tout pensif et tout morne,  
 L'un traîner en pleurant sa vache par la corne,  
 L'autre porter au col ses enfants et son lit,  
 Je m'enfermay trois jours renfrogné de despit,  
 Et prenant le papier et l'encre de colère,  
 De ce temps malheureux j'escrivis la misère,  
 Blasmant les presdicants lesquels avaient presché  
 Que par le fer mutin le peuple fust tranché;  
 Blasmant les assassins, les voleurs, et l'outrage  
 Des hommes reformez, cruels en brigandage . . . .<sup>1</sup>

M. Perdrizet n'accepte pas sans étonnement cette entrée en lutte du grand poète de la Pléiade.<sup>2</sup> Il rappelle avec complaisance qu'il fut l'auteur des *Amours*, des *Gayetés*, des *Bacchanales*, des *Dithyrambes*, des *Folastries*, bref un épicurien et un voluptueux. Était-ce bien à lui de se poser en champion de la pure doctrine chrétienne? Comment les austères huguenots n'auraient-ils pas souligné avec indignation ce contraste scandaleux? Ils n'y manquèrent pas, et M. Perdrizet fait chorus. Faut-il dire que son étonnement me semble naïf? Sans doute je n'ignore pas qu'après sa valeur intrinsèque, une doctrine se recommande par le mérite de ses docteurs. Mais quoi! Luther, Henri VIII., furent-ils des saints? Marot, Rabelais, Grévin, que d'ailleurs l'on fait protestants plus que de raison, furent-ils plus chrétiens que Ronsard? Ou veut-on dire que d'aider à la diffusion du culte nouveau, cela suffisait à racheter leurs péchés, et que Ronsard, s'il eût consacré son génie à la même cause, aurait cessé d'être un damnable païen? Ne voit-on pas au contraire que son abstention lui eût été amèrement reprochée,<sup>3</sup> que l'origi-

<sup>1</sup> Éd. it. Bl., t. VII, p. 129; cf. "Élégie à Guillaume des Autels," *ibid.*, p. 40. Si ne vois-je pourtant personne . . .

<sup>2</sup> Chap. iv, p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> Et au fait, on la lui a reprochée. HENRI MARTIN a écrit dans son *Histoire de France* (t. IX, pp. 10 sqq.): "Tout en reconnaissant aujourd'hui la valeur littéraire de Ronsard et de quelques-uns de ses acolytes, on ne peut cependant admettre leurs images sur cette voie sacrée de la tradition nationale que bordent les monuments de nos grands écrivains et nos grands artistes. Ils n'appartiennent pas à la vraie France, à cette Gaule française, dont ils étouffent la naïveté primesautière sous leur roideur et leur emphase; exclusivement préoccupés de la forme, affectant une égoïste indifférence pour tout ce qui fait la vraie grandeur

nalité de son initiative réside surtout dans ce fait qu'il s'est arraché à la vie sensuelle ou légère pour s'enfoncer dans une âpre bataille, détourné d'un dilettantisme moral pour reprendre contact avec les réalités poignantes du temps et contribuer de sa part à la défense religieuse et sociale? C'est pourquoi, dans l'étude actuelle de ses *Discours*, je m'inquiète peu si sa conduite l'autorisait à ce rôle. J'admets seulement qu'essayer de le déshonorer ainsi par avance, c'était de bonne guerre aux protestants. Rien de plus; ou l'arme pourrait se retourner contre eux-mêmes, tout ou moins contre quelques-uns de leurs plus chers amis.

Cependant M. Perdrizet va plus loin; ou plutôt du vieil épicurisme de Ronsard il conclut à un catholicisme tout de surface.<sup>1</sup> Ne confond-il pas deux choses assez distinctes, la croyance et la pratique? Réunies, c'est le chrétien parfait; séparées, c'est le chrétien inconséquent. Toutefois, le défaut de vie chrétienne, s'il prouve la faiblesse du caractère, n'implique pas nécessairement le défaut de conviction. Ronsard, malgré sa légèreté de conduite, a donc pu être un croyant sincère au dogme catholique. Faut-il entendre alors avec M. Perdrizet qu'il combat le protestantisme non pour ses dogmes, mais pour sa morale; que l'austérité de la religion nouvelle l'effraie; que le catholicisme était plus accommodant? De l'austérité réelle des huguenots je ne dirai rien personnellement; mais qu'elle fut la cause des répugnances de Ronsard, j'ai quelque peine à l'admettre, et ma grande raison, c'est qu'il n'y croyait pas, à tort ou à raison. Un extérieur sévère, hypocrite, des paroles fardées, c'est tout ce qu'il leur reconnaît. Leur vie intime, malgré les apparences, n'est pas plus chrétienne.<sup>2</sup>

Ou si vertu il y a, elle lui semblait trop étalée pour être sincère. Elle n'avait pas l'air de France. Elle était intolérante, triste, glacée. Elle éteignait le rire, la joie, proscrivait les arts. Genève, sous la férule de Calvin, était inhabitable aux libres esprits. Et il est vrai d'affirmer avec M. Perdrizet qu'en ce sens l'austérité huguenote déplaisait à Ronsard et sans doute à la plupart de ses

de l'homme pour les problèmes qui bouleversaient leur siècle, ils manquèrent cette forme qu'ils cherchaient avec tant de passion, et ne comprirent pas que les grands sentiments font seuls les grands styles." Nalf H. Martin! dit M. BRUNETIÈRE (*op. cit.*, p. 387). Evidemment il n'avait pas lu les *Discours des misères de ce temps*.

<sup>1</sup> Chap. v.

<sup>2</sup> "Continuation," Bl., t. VII, p. 27 et "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, p. 60.

contemporains. Rien de plus. Je ne dis pas que ce sentiment soit très-chrétien; mais il est assez français. Nous détestons les grimaces pieuses, les mômeries, l'austérité sombre et tyrannique. Au reste Calvin ni ses partisans n'ont le monopole de la vertu:

Elle a le dos ailé, elle passe la mer,  
Elle s'en-vole au ciel, elle marche sur terre . . . .

et tour à tour, elle visite tous les peuples à tous les coins de l'horizon.<sup>1</sup> Inutile d'embrasser l'évangile nouveau. Celui de l'Église suffit. Ce n'est pas l'avis de M. Perdrizet; il assure que le catholicisme gênait moins la licence des poètes de la Pléiade. Ici, il faudrait préciser. Le catholicisme de Charles IX. et de Henri III., soit; mais je ne pense pas qu'on veuille le confondre tout à fait avec celui de l'Église elle-même. En tout cas, Ronsard, si faible qu'il fût dans ses passions, ne les autorisa jamais de sa foi. Si donc il lui resta fidèle, ce dut être pour des motifs plus graves. Notez qu'il n'est pas aveugle sur les abus de la religion romaine:

. . . . Depuis saint Gregoire,  
Nul pape dont le nom soit escrit dans l'histoire  
En chaire ne prescha . . . .

Des enfants de quinze ans, de jeunes muguets tiennent le gouvernail; ils vivent sans peine,

Sans prescher, sans prier, sans bon exemple d'eux,  
Parfumez, découpez, courtisans, amoureux.

L'Église

. . . . fut jadis fondée en humblesse d'esprit,  
En toute patience, en toute obéissance,  
Sans argent, sans crédit, sans force ny puissance,  
Pauvre, nue, exilée, ayant jusques aux os  
Les coups de fouets sanglants imprimez sur le dos;  
Et la voir aujourd'hui riche, grasse et hautaine,  
Toute pleine d'escus, de rente et de domaine?  
Ses ministres enflés et ses Papes encor  
Pompeusement vestus de soye et de drap d'or?<sup>2</sup>

Notez encore que le protestantisme faillit le séduire:

<sup>1</sup> "Réponse," *ibid.*, pp. 120, 121.

<sup>2</sup> "Élégie à Guillaume des Autels," *ibid.*, p. 42; cf. "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, p. 66; *ibid.*, p. 75; "Réponse," *ibid.*, p. 110.

J'ay autrefois gousté, quand j'étais jeune d'âge,  
Du miel empoisonné de vostre doux breuvage.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

Si vous n'eussiez parlé que d'amender l'Église,  
Que d'oster les abus de l'avare prestrise,  
Je vous eusse suivi, et n'eusse pas esté  
Le moindre des suivants qui vous ont escouté.<sup>2</sup>

Mais s'il hait les abus, il aime toujours l'Église.<sup>3</sup> Il résiste donc aux séductions de la doctrine réformée, aux invitations flatteuses de ses partisans. Pourquoi ? Par des raisons que M. Brunetière appelle des raisons de théologien,<sup>4</sup> et M. Perdrizet des objections de chancellerie.<sup>5</sup> Examinons-les. Nous déciderons après. Ronsard s'en tient à la tradition ; il n'admet pas que tant d'hommes savants et pieux aient erré si longtemps, que Dieu ait laissé pendant quinze siècles l'humanité sans lumière sur la véritable Église :<sup>6</sup>

Le libre examen le révolte par son orgueil, un double orgueil. Premièrement, les Réformés se croient les interprètes assurés de la parole de Dieu.

. . . . Les Docteurs de ces sectes nouvelles,  
Comme si l'Esprit saint avait usé ses ailes  
À s'appuyer sur eux . . . .  
Sans que honte ou vergogne en leur coeur trouve trace,  
Parlent profondément des mystères de Dieu,  
Ils sont ses conseillers, ils sont ses secrétaires,  
Ils savent ses avis, ils savent ses affaires,  
Ils ont la clef du ciel, et y entrent tout seuls,  
Et qui y veut entrer, il faut parler à eux.<sup>7</sup>

Ensuite leur outrecuidance va jusqu'à vouloir expliquer les mystères, l'inconnaissable. Et Ronsard les en raille ; ou plutôt en vers pleins et graves, il leur rappelle que le secret de Dieu est impénétrable, et que la modestie convient à notre raison, infirme dans les choses naturelles les plus simples.<sup>8</sup> Du reste voici le châtimement de cette présomption. Le sens propre entraîne les Réformés dans un abîme de variations :

<sup>1</sup> "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 380.

<sup>5</sup> Chap. vi, p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> "Élégie à Guillaume des Autels," Bl., t. VII, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup> "Remonstrance," Bl., t. VII, p. 59.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

Les apostres jadis preschaient tous d'un accord;  
 Entre vous aujourd'hui ne règne que discord;  
 Les uns sont Zwingliens, les autres Lutheristes,  
 Les autres Puritains, Quintins, Anabaptistes . . .  
 Vous devriez pour le moins, avant que nous troubler,  
 Estre ensemble d'accord sans vous désassembler;  
 Car Christ n'est pas un Dieu de noise ny discorde:  
 Christ n'est que charité, qu'amour et que concorde,  
 Et montrez clairement par la division  
 Que Dieu n'est point autheur de vostre opinion.<sup>1</sup>

En vérité, je ne sais pourquoi M. Perdrizet dédaigne ces raisons comme surannées ou de mince valeur. Surannées, elles le sont, comme la tradition qui puise sa force dans son antiquité même. Ce n'est pas une petite gloire à un penseur de devancer Pascal et Bossuet. Je ne veux pas écraser Ronsard par le voisinage de ces grands noms. Mais je remarque avec Brunetière qu'il les rappelle; et M. Perdrizet a-t-il songé que Pascal et Bossuet ont fait, après tous les Pères de l'Église, les mêmes objections à l'hérésie, je veux dire au protestantisme, et qu'en tombant de leur plume, elles sont peut-être quelque chose de plus que des objections de chancellerie? En tout cas, il doit bien admettre qu'ici Ronsard pensait en vrai catholique, tout pénétré du pur esprit catholique, et donc qu'il fut autre chose qu'un humaniste païen. Que si l'on trouve ces raisons trop extérieures à la religion, qu'on lise les vers sur la justification par la foi, sur la présence réelle.<sup>2</sup> Ronsard s'y explique nettement sur les points essentiels. Comment, après lecture de ces passages et d'autres analogues, M. Perdrizet peut-il prétendre que le poète ne connaissait pas les dogmes nouveaux?<sup>3</sup> Je sais bien que ce critique appelle le catholicisme un christianisme d'autorité, et la Réforme un christianisme de liberté, tout intérieur.<sup>4</sup> Ronsard aurait pu répondre que celui-ci peut s'accorder avec celui-là, qu'il en fut ainsi aux premiers siècles de l'Église, et même depuis. S'il ne parle pas de ce christianisme cher à M. Perdrizet, c'est qu'il ne le trouve pas chez ses amis, c'est qu'il croit en trouver justement le contraire;

<sup>1</sup> "Continuation," *ibid.*, pp. 26, 27.

<sup>2</sup> "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, pp. 57, 58.

<sup>3</sup> Chap. vi, pp. 71, 72.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76.

Eh quoy ! brusler maisons, piller et brigander,  
 Tuer, assassiner, par force commander,  
 N'obéir plus aux Rois, amasser des armées,  
 Appelez-vous cela Eglises réformées ?  
 Jésus que seulement vous confessez icy  
 De bouche et non de cœur ne faisait pas ainsi;  
 Et saint Paul en preschant n'avait pour toutes armes  
 Sinon l'humilité, les jeusnes et les larmes;  
 Et les pères martyrs aux plus dures saisons  
 Des tyrans ne s'armaient sinon que d'oraisons.<sup>1</sup>

Mettons qu'il se trompe sur la valeur morale de la Réforme, ainsi que je le pense; mais ne disons pas qu'il n'a rien vu, qu'il n'a connu ni le protestantisme ni les protestants. Il me semble au contraire que ce poète, nourri d'imaginations païennes, ne fut pas exclusivement préoccupé de choses d'art ou de volupté. Il pense, il raisonne, il discute non-seulement avec éloquence mais avec une intelligence très-avisée. Qu'il n'ait rien d'un Calvin ou d'un Théodore de Bèze, je le veux bien. Mais Marot non plus. Pourquoi reprocher ce malheur au seul Ronsard, dont au surplus ce n'était pas l'affaire d'écrire une "Institution chrétienne." Je conçois que M. Perdrizet ne soit pas ému de ses arguments. Où Ronsard et d'autres, après lui, voient de l'orgueil, la ruine de toute religion positive, je veux dire dans le libre examen, notre écrivain salue la source d'une religion libre et sincère. Les variations continuelles du protestantisme, signe d'erreur pour Ronsard et Bossuet, lui semblent une preuve de vitalité immortelle. Soit; je ne suis pas assez grand clerc en la matière pour discuter avec lui, même si j'en avais le goût. Seulement il a tort de refuser à Ronsard la sincérité et la conviction raisonnée de sa foi. Elles éclatent dans les *Discours*.

M. Perdrizet préfère insister sur le patriotisme et le loyalisme du chef de la Pléiade. Je ne veux pas insinuer que c'est un moyen d'affaiblir la portée de ces poèmes, que cela reviendrait à dire: les *Discours* n'ont aucune valeur religieuse; les meilleurs arguments sont d'un conservateur en politique. Donc l'œuvre est intéressée; pas le moindre soupçon des questions profondes qui agitaient les âmes. Si je force un peu les sentiments de l'auteur,

<sup>1</sup> "Continuation," Bl., t. VII, p. 18.

je ne calomnie pas la pensée d'autres critiques. M. Lanson a écrit dans la *Revue universitaire*,<sup>1</sup> à propos justement du livre de M. Perdrizet: "le patriotisme et l'intérêt me paraissent les mobiles profonds de Ronsard." Et M. Laumonier dans la même *Revue*:<sup>2</sup>

Il serait facile de montrer combien se cachait d'intérêt personnel sous les apparentes convictions de Ronsard. A aucun moment de sa carrière, il n'a été poète plus officiel et solliciteur plus pressant. L'égoïsme a été bien plus encore que le patriotisme sa vraie muse en ces années-là: ce fut la cause principale de l'éloquence et du lyrisme de ses *Discours*.

Voilà qui est net. Il serait superflu de rechercher si l'esprit de parti n'inspire pas en sourdine quelques-uns de ces jugements. Voyons plutôt en toute indépendance si leur sévérité est justifiée.

La Réforme, odieuse à Ronsard catholique, le fut davantage peut-être à Ronsard patriote. Il aimait la France pour son climat, sa richesse, sa beauté.<sup>3</sup> *Une foy, une loy, un roy*; à l'ombre de cette devise, la France avait merveilleusement prospéré. Survient la Réforme, et le sol est jonché de ruines. Ronsard s'indigne avec éloquence:

Ha! que diront là-bas, sous leurs tombes poudreuses,  
De tant de vaillants roys les âmes généreuses?  
Que dira Pharamond, Clodion et Clovis?  
Nos Pepins, nos Martels, nos Charles, nos Loys?  
Qui de leur propre sang versé parmy la guerre  
Ont acquis à nos Roys une aussi belle terre? etc.<sup>4</sup>

Mais, dira-t-on, les droits de la conscience? C'est entendu, ils sont sacrés, au-dessus des lois humaines. Ronsard y croyait, nous le montrerons tout à l'heure. Mais il pensait, peut-être avec raison, qu'ils n'exigent pas la révolte à main armée, le sang répandu, tous les crimes enfin des guerres civiles. Les Protestants devaient ramener les temps héroïques et saints du jeune christianisme. Ronsard a beau jeu pour souligner le contraste entre leurs prétentions et leur conduite.<sup>5</sup> D'ailleurs la doctrine nouvelle, venue de l'étranger, lui est suspecte à ce titre même.

<sup>1</sup> 15 novembre 1902, p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> 15 février 1903, p. 149, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Épilogues*, "Chanson des pasteurs." Cf. "Hymne à la Franco," publié en 1549, retranché plus tard du recueil de ses *Œuvres*; cf. "Continuation," Bl., t. VII, p. 29; *Élégie à Guillaume des Autels*, pp. 43, 44.

<sup>4</sup> "Discours des misères de ce temps," Bl., t. VII, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> "Continuation," *ibid.*, p. 18.



Je n'aime point ces noms qui sont finis en *ots*,  
Gots, Cagots, Austrogots, Visigots, Huguenots.  
Ils sont prodigieux à l'empire de France.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

Ils faillent de laisser le chemin de leurs pères,  
Pour ensuivre le train des sectes étrangères.<sup>2</sup>

Assurément l'Esprit souffle où il veut, la lumière est bonne à recevoir, d'où qu'elle vienne, pourvu qu'elle soit évidemment la lumière. Or, rien ne l'imposait à Ronsard, et si, en bon humaniste, il est convaincu qu'est toujours vraie la pensée du poète: *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, comment le lui reprocher? D'autant que les événements justifiaient ses craintes. Les Réformés, poussés par la parenté religieuse, faisaient appel à l'étranger. Et Ronsard proteste avec une tristesse éloquente.<sup>3</sup> S'ils avaient eu, dit-il, son patriotisme, ni les reîtres allemands, ni "les blonds nourrissons de la froide Angleterre," n'eussent fait leur proie de la France malheureuse.<sup>4</sup> Certes, je n'ignore pas qu'au milieu des discordes civiles, la fumée des combats peut obscurcir le chemin du devoir. C'est une excuse. Mais, religion mise à part, on peut admettre que le patriotisme de Ronsard était clairvoyant. Et ici, il est inutile d'opposer à ses justes plaintes les connivences de son propre parti avec l'Espagne. Nul plus que lui ne les a déplorées.<sup>5</sup> C'est pourquoi, devant ses adversaires, il garde le droit de leur crier son indignation. Elle est sincère et légitime. Aussi, je ne comprends pas bien, après tant de citations que M. Laumonnier ait pu écrire "qu'en fait d'étrangers Ronsard en a voulu surtout à ceux qui obtenaient au lieu de lui les abbayes et les pensions, en particulier les avarés Italiens."<sup>6</sup> Sans doute, il fut intéressé; nous le dirons tout à l'heure. Mais il a été autre chose, et c'est pour autre chose qu'il s'est jeté dans la mêlée. La ruine matérielle et politique de la France, l'invasion, avec son noir cortège de maux, Ronsard en a cru voir clairement les causes. Son patriotisme en souffre, et, avec sa foi, c'est lui surtout qui l'éloigne des protestants. S'il est farouche, parfois, s'il pousse à la vengeance, si un souffle de haine le traverse, ce n'est pas seule-

<sup>1</sup> "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> "Élégie à Guillaume des Autels," *ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> "Continuation," *ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup> "Réponse," *ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> "Discours des misères de ce temps," *ibid.*, p. 14; "Remonstrance," *ibid.*, p. 69. <sup>6</sup> P. 160.

ment, comme dit M. Laumonnier,<sup>1</sup> parce que les protestants avaient tenté de l'assassiner physiquement et moralement. Certes, en ce cas, il lui était bien permis d'être ému plus que de raison. Toutefois les tentatives contre sa personne, les pamphlets suivirent son entrée en campagne. Que cela l'ait enfoncé plus avant dans la lutte, d'accord. Mais cela ne l'a pas inspiré. En réalité, l'amour de la France tient aux racines profondes de son cœur, et toute insulte à cette mère le soulève hors de lui.<sup>2</sup> Amour malgré tout bien pur, celui qui dicte ces vers :

De Bèze, je te prie, escoute ma parolle . . . .  
 La terre qu'aujourd'hui tu remplis toute d'armes . . . .  
 De Bèze, ce n'est pas une terre gothique  
 Ny une région Tartare ny Scythique;  
 C'est celle où tu naquis, qui douce te receust,  
 Alors qu'à Vézelay ta mère te conceust;  
 Celle qui t'a nourry et qui t'a fait apprendre  
 La science et les arts dès ta jeunesse tendre,  
 Pour luy faire service et pour en bien user,  
 Et non, comme tu fais, à fin d'en abuser.<sup>3</sup>

Enfin, après les déchirements de ces longues guerres, touché des malheurs du pays, les ardeurs de la lutte éteintes, Ronsard fait entendre des paroles de paix. Il invoque la tolérance et la

<sup>1</sup> P. 150. Cf. Bl., t. VII, p. 70, derniers vers; et *ibid.*, pp. 87-95.

<sup>2</sup> Après avoir loué Coligny, fidèle à sa foi première (Bl., t. V, pp. 42, 43, 63, 295; t. VI, p. 304), il fait des vœux pour sa mort, t. VII, p. 153. De même, il demande à Dieu la mort de Condé, s'il ne désarme point, t. VII, p. 80. Plus tard, la paix faite en 1563, il revient à l'éloge du prince, t. VII, pp. 128, 129. Enfin, Condé redevenant en 1665 chef des Huguenots avec Coligny, Ronsard célèbre leurs défaites, et particulièrement la mort de Condé à Jarnac, 1569 ("Chant triomphal pour jouer sur la lyre," ou "Hymne," IX Bl., t. V, p. 146). M. LAUMONNIER blâme cette conduite opposée (p. 157, n. 1). Il l'attribue à la muse courtesanesque et prostituée du poète (*Revue d'hist. littéraire de la France*, juillet-sept. 1902, p. 444). Courtisan, Ronsard le fut, et trop, je l'avoue. Toutefois cette "palinodie" à l'égard de Coligny et de Condé fut-elle seulement un effet de la courtesanerie? Certes, elle ne devait pas déplaire à la cour. Mais Ronsard proclame des sentiments d'un ordre plus élevé, qui s'accordent avec les sentiments généraux des *Discours*. Quoiqu'il en soit de ses habitudes courtesanesques, nous devons croire à sa sincérité, quand il explique sa conduite par ces vers (t. VII, p. 75) :

" . . . L'amour du pays et de ses lois aussi  
 Et de la vérité me fait parler ainsi."

Il veut dire sans doute que, dévoué à ces personnages, tant qu'eux-mêmes furent dévoués à l'Eglise et au roi, il les traita en ennemis, quand ils trahirent leurs devoirs, quand, véritables chefs de la révolte, il pouvait les considérer auteurs responsables des maux qui la suivirent. Je suis loin pourtant d'excuser ses souhaits sanglants, et encore moins ces pièces d'accent cruel: "Prière à Dieu pour la victoire," l'"Hydre défait," l'"Hymne aux étoiles;" elles s'expliquent, sans se justifier, lorsqu'on tient compte de toutes les circonstances.

<sup>3</sup> "Continuation," Bl., t. VII, p. 21.

douceur dans la répression.<sup>1</sup> Ce n'est pas une palinodie. Mais le patriotisme, qui l'avait jeté dans la bataille, ce même patriotisme, mieux éclairé sur les besoins de la France, lui inspirait des accents de concorde. Et cela, à l'époque de la Ligue, quand les fureurs meurtrières étaient encore déchaînées. Preuve de sa clairvoyance et de sa sincérité courageuse.

Parce qu'il aime la France, Ronsard soutient ses rois. Chez lui, patriotisme et loyalisme ne font qu'un. Et au fait, en ces temps-là, la France, c'était le roi; il la personnifiait; tous les coups qu'on lui adressait retombaient sur elle. On serait donc mal venu de reprocher à Ronsard son royalisme. Que dirait-on alors de Marot, de Calvin qui dédie l'"Institution chrétienne" à François I<sup>er</sup>; de Coligny, "imbu d'idolâtrie monarchique;" d'Anne du Bourg prêt "à bailler au Prince son sang, voire jusqu'à sa chemise"?<sup>2</sup> Seulement cet amour n'empêchait pas leur révolte. Ronsard conçoit autrement son devoir. Son royalisme est ardemment sincère. Qu'on lise l'"Épitaphe pour le tombeau de Marguerite de France," où il pleure sur

le sang valesien  
Qui de beautés, de grâce et de lustre, ressemble  
Au lys qui naît, fleurit, et se meurt tout ensemble.<sup>3</sup>

Devant les tombes prématurément ouvertes, où descendirent à la fleur des ans Henri II., François II., Charles IX., sans compter auparavant les fils de François I<sup>er</sup>, son cœur s'épanche en accents profondément émus. Aussi, lorsque de leur vivant, il s'indigne contre les Réformés, dont la sédition abreuve de soucis et de chagrins leur royauté, sa tendresse est aussi atteinte que son patriotisme. Dire que c'est "le dévouement d'un petit gentilhomme poète qui ne subsiste que par la bonté des rois, sans terre ni alliances, ni subsistance aucune hors la faveur royale;"<sup>4</sup> expliquer "son fanatisme par des raisons égoïstes, reconnaissance à l'égard de ses bienfaiteurs royaux . . ."<sup>5</sup> par le besoin de faire la cour aux Guise et à Catherine de Médicis, n'est-ce pas rapetisser de parti-pris un sentiment qui ne manquait pas de noble hardiesse?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. PEERDIZET, chap. xi, pp. 134, sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>3</sup> *Bl.*, t. VII, pp. 177-91

<sup>4</sup> LANSON, *Revue universitaire*, 15 nov. 1902, p. 373.

<sup>5</sup> LAUMONNIER, *ibid.*, 15 fév. 1903, p. 150.

S'il obéissait à des motifs aussi bas, qu'on nous dise alors pourquoi il ne s'adresse pas aux Châtillon, aux Condé, enfin aux têtes puissantes du protestantisme? L'issue de la lutte était incertaine à l'époque des *Discours*. Catherine de Médicis hésita longtemps entre les deux partis. Jusqu'en 1564, voire même jusqu'en 1569, personne ne pouvait deviner où pencherait la balance. Un poète intéressé eût évité de se compromettre; et qui sait? il n'eût rien perdu à se mettre du côté des Réformés. Car enfin ils lui prodiguèrent avances et promesses. S'il les dédaigna, c'est qu'il chérissait davantage son pays et ses rois. Certes, il aima les bénéfices, et trop, si l'on veut. Comme Corneille, plus tard, "il fut saoul de gloire et affamé d'argent."<sup>1</sup> Mais si personne n'osera imputer à l'intérêt les nobles inspirations du poète dramatique, si malgré les dédicaces à la Montorron,<sup>2</sup> il reste le grand Corneille, pourquoi Ronsard cesserait-il d'être un patriote sincère, un royaliste convaincu, parce que le soin de sa fortune s'est concilié avec son loyalisme, ou pour avoir payé un large tribut à la reconnaissance? Aimerait-on mieux qu'il eût été ingrat? M. Perdrizet voit plus juste; il note complaisamment sans doute le côté quémendeur de Ronsard, mais il rend hommage à la sincérité de "son idolâtrie monarchique."<sup>3</sup> Et s'il est vrai qu'en cette circonstance le poète représente l'opinion de ses contemporains, sa fidélité n'en est que plus significative. Nous pouvons croire que ce n'est pas l'intérêt seul qui l'a maintenue, mais, avec un dévouement spontané, la conviction que la cause des rois était liée à la cause même de la France. Qu'il ait eu tort ou raison, la question n'est pas là. Nous en sommes à discerner ses vrais sentiments. M. Perdrizet reconnaît la pure qualité de son patriotisme. Même il explique par les idées politiques du patriote les idées religieuses du catholique.<sup>4</sup> Je crois l'explication fausse. La foi me paraît indépendante de son loyalisme. Mais je trouve l'affirmation du critique bien imprudente. Si elle était vraie, cela reviendrait à dire que catholique et français ne faisaient qu'un. Quelle plus terrible condamnation du protestantisme? Telle n'est pas la pensée de M. Perdrizet ni des critiques sérieux

<sup>1</sup> Cité par LANSON, *Corneille*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Cinna* Dédicace.

<sup>3</sup> PERDRIZET, pp. 106, 108.

<sup>4</sup> P. 106.

que nous avons nommés. Et en effet ces deux sentiments ne sont pas à confondre. C'est pourtant à cette confusion que mènerait leur polémique.

Je la trouve encore injuste sur un autre point. M. Lanson écrit: "L'humanisme fournit les beaux lieux communs dont s'étoffaient et se pavoisent ces sentiments primitifs: idée d'un état pacifique et bien ordonné, idée d'un empire bienfaisant, que décorent des poètes bien payés," etc.<sup>1</sup> Et M. Laumonier: "Il resta humaniste dans ses *Discours* avec une âme superficiellement catholique et un art profondément païen."<sup>2</sup> Ronsard célébra la paix, l'ordre, la soumission aux lois. Ce sont des lieux communs, j'en conviens. Mais veut-on insinuer par là que chez Ronsard, ils constituent un développement de rhéteur, qu'il imite seulement Lucrèce, Horace, Properce, Virgile? Il faudrait alors n'avoir pas lu l'"Ode sur la paix," datée de 1550, où l'on trouve ces vers émus:

Je te salue, heureuse Paix,  
Je te salue et re-salue:  
Toi seule, déesse, tu fais  
que la vie soit mieux voulue.  
Ainsi que les champs tapissez  
de pampre, ou d'espics hérissiez  
désirent les filles des nues  
après les chaleurs survenues,  
Ainsi la France t'attendait,  
douce nourricière des hommes.  
En lieu du fer outrageux,  
des menaces et des flames,  
tu nous rameines les jeux,  
le bal et l'amour des dames.<sup>3</sup>

Les anciens lui ont-ils inspiré le christianisme qui remplit la première partie de l'"Exhortation pour la paix"?<sup>4</sup> Il y invite les combattants à se réconcilier sur le dos des Turcs, à les chasser du saint sépulchre qu'ils déshonorent, à planter en terre sainte les étendards du Christ. J'indiquerais encore le poème des "Armes."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup> *Bl.*, t. II, p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Bl.*, t. VI, pp. 212, 213, 210.

<sup>5</sup> *Poèmes* (1590), t. VI, pp. 39 sqq. Si l'on veut à toute force que Ronsard ait imité quelqu'un, mieux vaut comme M. VIANEY (*Revue universitaire*, 15 mai 1903) rapprocher ces pièces du *Roland Furieux* de l'ARIOSTE, chap. xvii, sts. 75-79, pour l'"Exhortation pour la paix," à propos des Turcs; et chap. xix, sts. 28, 29, 74, 75; chap. xi, sts. 24-27, pour le poème sur les "Armes" (malédiction contre les armes à feu).

Il y a là des imprécations d'un accent trop sincère pour ressembler aux exercices littéraires d'un humaniste. Et du reste, Ronsard semble avoir répondu par avance à ce reproche, quand il nous raconte dans son premier *Discours* à quelles inspirations il obéit.<sup>1</sup> Pour la forme, pour le fond même, de ces poèmes, il a pu se souvenir des anciens. Et pourquoi pas? C'était son droit, dès lors qu'il versait dans ce moule antique, sinon une matière nouvelle, du moins une chaleur personnelle, et qu'il vivifiait ces lieux communs d'une conviction propre. Ce n'est pas à M. Lanson qu'il faut apprendre la véritable originalité. Nos grands classiques, et Victor Hugo en particulier, nous ont enseigné par leurs exemples où est vraiment l'invention créatrice, ce qu'on peut faire des idées générales quand on a du génie. C'est donc peine inutile de vouloir amoindrir les *Discours* en leur accolant l'épithète commode d'humanisme.

En revanche, cet humanisme se trahit ailleurs et d'autre manière, dans les plaintes que Ronsard formule contre les tumultes de la guerre, obstacles au labeur tranquille de l'étude.<sup>2</sup> Il en veut aux protestants d'interrompre ses travaux de poète, d'en compromettre les résultats. Il soupire encore après les plaisirs de cour, après les jeux des Muses, et dans une "Élégie à Catherine de Médicis,"<sup>3</sup> qui voyage à travers la France, il supplie la reine de retourner aux Tuileries ou dans quelqu'un de ses châteaux, pour y renouveler les mascarades, les aubades, et autres divertissements. Or, si je comprends ces regrets chez un poète, dont tous les goûts d'artiste étaient flattés par l'éclat des fêtes royales, je conviens avec M. Perdrizet que ce n'était pas l'heure de les exprimer. Quand la discorde civile déchaîne ses fureurs, quand la patrie saigne, quand la religion nationale est secouée jusqu'en ses fondements, il y a d'autres plaintes à gémir. Ronsard l'a oublié. Mais ne disons pas que tel fut le fond de son âme, que l'humanisme explique son patriotisme, enfin que ces deux sentiments, omission faite ou à peu près de sa foi religieuse, inspirèrent les *Discours*. Dit M. Lanson:

Les arguments de Ronsard contre l'hérésie, sont des arguments extérieurs qui impliquent un refus d'examiner les questions théolo-

<sup>1</sup> V. plus haut, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> PERDRIZET, chap. viii.

<sup>3</sup> *Bocage royal*, II, 2, éd. 1584.

giques. Et ce refus n'est possible dans un esprit cultivé, que quand ces questions ne sont plus pour lui les questions vitales. Déjà pour Ronsard la religion n'est plus, à son insu, qu'une forme extérieure, une cérémonie habituelle que recommandent l'usage des ancêtres et la loi du royaume, une partie des convenances et des institutions; la vie de sa conscience n'est plus là et ne s'y alimente plus. Et ici l'humanisme reprend sa place prépondérante; la philosophie des anciens tend chez Ronsard à se substituer à la religion chrétienne comme directrice de la vie et formatrice de la conscience. Ronsard est catholique pour les mêmes raisons que Montaigne.<sup>1</sup>

Et à son tour M. Laumonnier:<sup>2</sup>

De convictions profondes peu ou point, comme chez Montaigne, bien qu'il se dise ainsi que lui partisan de l'ancien train contre les nouvelles.

Nous avons essayé de montrer plus haut que les arguments de Ronsard, même au point de vue théologique, n'étaient pas aussi légers qu'on veut bien le prétendre. Mais en outre et une fois de plus, nous nous étonnons qu'on réclame de lui des controverses dogmatiques sur le fond même des questions qui divisaient les esprits. En eût-il été capable, la forme même de ses *Discours*, petits pamphlets, n'y prêtait guère. Et si elles étaient au-dessus de ses forces, nous ne saurions l'en mépriser. Car en vérité ce n'était pas son affaire. Il est entré dans la querelle, non en théologien, mais en simple catholique lettré et en bon Français. Que veut-on de plus? Il est bien facile de l'accabler quand on lui reproche de n'avoir pas fait ce qu'il ne voulait pas faire. Et conclure, comme certains critiques, qu'il n'avait pas de convictions profondes, que la question religieuse n'était pas pour lui une question vitale, c'est aller bien loin, trop loin. Encore un coup, je ne veux point rappeler les raisons traditionnelles qu'il a données de sa croyance. Mais si on les dédaigne parce que traditionnelles, qu'on veuille remarquer de quel ton chaleureux Ronsard les expose, le ton d'un homme qui croit fermement. Ajoutez la belle profession de foi grave, solide, éloquente qu'on trouve dans la "Réponse aux prédicants."<sup>3</sup> C'est un *credo* bien catholique; ce n'est pas une vaine formule; car il est prêt à mourir pour elle. Malgré les abus,

<sup>1</sup> *Revue universitaire*, 15 nov. 1902, p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 fév. 1903, p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, t. VII, pp. 107-10.



Je ne me veux pourtant séparer de l'Église,  
Ny ne ferai jamais ! Plustost par mille efforts,  
Je voudrais endurer l'horreur de mille morts.<sup>1</sup>

Quant à la religion du prédicant qui l'a insulté,

je proteste,

s'écrie-t-il,

que si horriblement ton erreur je déteste,  
Que mille et mille morts j'ayme mieux recevoir  
Que laisser ma raison de ton fard décevoir.<sup>2</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*  
. . . l'Évangile saint du Sauveur Jésus-Christ  
m'a fermement gravée une foy dans l'esprit,  
que je ne veux changer pour une foy nouvelle;  
Et dussé-je endurer une mort très-cruelle,  
De tant de nouveautés je ne suis curieux !<sup>3</sup>

Dira-t-on qu'il est facile de braver la mort en vers ? Soit ; j'ignore en effet si Ronsard eût, à l'occasion, accepté le martyre. Mais tout de même, estimer, voire en vers, sa foi, plus cher que sa vie, c'est montrer qu'elle n'est pas purement extérieure à l'âme, quoiqu'elle n'ait pas toujours réglé la conscience. En tout cas, je sais bien que Montaigne, à qui l'on compare volontiers Ronsard, n'a jamais parlé de mourir pour sa foi ; il s'en tient paresseusement au train de ses aïeux, sans se mêler aux polémiques irritantes, sans s'expliquer à lui-même, ou du moins sans expliquer aux autres ses raisons. L'humaniste et l'égoïste, le voilà. Ronsard est autre.

Concluons : M. Brunetière simplifie, en les ennoblissant plus que de raison, les mobiles de l'auteur des *Discours*. Trop attentif peut-être aux troubles de l'époque présente, il cherche des analogies et des arguments dans le passé. Cette préoccupation n'est guère scientifique. M. Perdrizet mieux renseigné, impartial dans une assez large manière, cherche à expliquer avec une psychologie souvent heureuse les opinions de Ronsard, surtout par des raisons politiques et littéraires. Sans parler de mes réserves, même sur ce point, j'ai montré qu'il ne rend pas justice à ses convictions catholiques. Les *Discours* ont été composés au souffle des discordes civiles. Les sentiments de Ronsard furent complexes.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

Il y entre de la reconnaissance pour ses princes, de la haine pour ses adversaires qui l'avaient outragé, du conservatisme politique, enfin de la littérature humaniste. Qu'on fasse de ces mobiles bonne mesure, j'y souscris; car il y a trace de tout cela dans ces poèmes, et je l'ai noté après d'autres. Mais quand on est convenu de ces éléments plus ou moins purs, il reste qu'une très grande part, la principale, revient à la sincérité de sa foi, une foi très raisonnée—à l'ardeur de son patriotisme, un patriotisme très noble—à sa ferveur monarchique, plus désintéressée qu'on ne l'assure, et d'ailleurs très avisée dans son loyalisme. Il reste encore que penseur, polémiste, orateur en vers il dépasse son époque. "Jamais la poésie en France n'avait eu ces accents ni ce rôle."<sup>1</sup> C'est pourquoi et à ce titre, les *Discours* s'élèvent audessus des *Amours*, des *Hymnes* et des *Élégies*. Pour faire bref, ils sont bien une date dans l'histoire de la littérature française.

E. J. DUBEDOUT.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

<sup>1</sup> E. FAGUET, *XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 254.

## ZUM GOTISCHEN ALPHABET.<sup>1</sup>

DIE beiden ansichten über das von Wulfila bei der herstellung seines alphabets eingeschlagene verfahren, die sich geltung zu verschaffen gewusst haben, sind die von Zacher verteidigte und diejenige Wimmers. Ersterer kommt zu dem schlusse, dass das von Wulfila benutzte griechische alphabet ihm mehr ideell als materiell zur grundlage gedient hat, dass er vielmehr ganz im geiste der alten heimischen schriftentwicklung verfahren ist, indem er entweder seine runen nur veränderte, um sie den griechischen buchstaben ähnlich zu machen, oder griechische formen aufnahm, wo die runen unzweckmässig erschienen, oder die runen fast unverändert beibehielt, wo sich für den betreffenden laut ein passendes griechisches zeichen nicht darbot, oder schliesslich denjenigen runen, die freigeworden waren und mit einem zeichen des griechischen alphabets der gestalt nach zusammenfielen, die geltung des griechischen zeichens gab.<sup>2</sup> Ähnlich drückt sich auch Raszmann aus,<sup>3</sup> dass Wulfilas alphabet noch immer den allgemeinen character der runenschrift beibehielt, wenn er auch das griechische alphabet und dessen ordnung zu grunde legte und auch dem lateinischen, namentlich der current-schrift, einfluss gestattete.

Aber die gegenwärtig allgemein acceptierte ansicht von dem ursprung des gotischen alphabets beruht ganz und gar auf den von Wimmer erlangten resultaten, wie er sie im *Anhang I* seiner *Runenschrift, Das Wulfilanische alphabet*, ss. 259–74, darlegt. Er hält dafür, dass das gotische alphabet das griechische zur grundlage<sup>4</sup> hat, welches letztere den grösseren teil der buchstaben

<sup>1</sup> Die notwendigkeit Wimmers ansicht von dem ursprung des Wulfilanischen alphabets noch einmal einer genauen prüfung zu unterziehen, pflegte schon der vor mehreren jahren verstorbene professor Hench zu betonen, und es war seine absicht, während des letzten sommers in seinem leben seine gründe für eine entgegenstehende meinung genau auszu- arbeiten. Der unglücksfall, der seinen tod herbeiführte, verhinderte ihn daran. Wiederholte gespräche mit ihm über diese frage und einige schriftliche aufzeichnungen, die er schon dazu gemacht hatte, habe ich verwerten können; so gereicht es mir zur genugthuung, dass ich darauf fussend das folgende zur verteidigung seiner ansicht vorbringen kann.

<sup>2</sup> ZACHER, *Das got. alph. Wulfilas und das runenalph.*, ss. 52 f.

<sup>3</sup> ERSCH U. GRUBER, *Allg. encyclopädie d. wiss. u. künste*, I, 75, ss. 301 ff. <sup>4</sup> Ss. 262, 270.

für das erstere abgegeben und auch mit bezug auf die reihenfolge der buchstaben als muster gedient hat. Aus dem lateinischen nahm Wulfila sechs buchstaben in das seinige auf und zwar aus verschiedenen gründen:

1. weil für gewisse gotische laute, wie got. *h* und *j*, das griechische überhaupt keine zeichen besass (s. 266);

2. weil im falle des *f* der lateinische buchstabe *f* den gotischen laut genauer wiedergab als griech. *φ*, da das gotische und lateinische einen labiodentalen, das griechische aber einen bilabialen laut hatte (ss. 263, 266);

3. weil die griechischen zeichen *P* und *C* mit den lateinischen von verschiedener bedeutung zusammenfielen (s. 266);

4. wurde aus verschiedenen complizierten gründen, die Wulfila genügend für seine wahl erschienen, *u* im werte von *q* aus dem lateinischen aufgenommen (s. 267);

5. fanden auch zwei buchstaben aus dem runischen futhark aufnahme in das neue alphabet, ohne dass Wimmer einen klaren grund dafür anzugeben weiss, wenn er auch sagt, dass sie vielleicht deswegen aus dem runenalphabet aufgenommen wurden, weil sie besonders bequem zu schreiben waren (s. 270);

Wimmer fasst seine ansicht folgendermassen zusammen:

Wulfila benutzte als grundlage für seine schrift das griechische uncialalphabet; aber wo dies nicht für seinen zweck genügend war, wandte er sich zum lateinischen, und nur für zwei buchstaben nahm er zeichen aus der runenschrift auf (s. 270).

Das heisst also anders ausgedrückt: als Wulfila mit dem gedanken umging, die griechische bibel ins gotische zu übersetzen, fand er sich der notwendigkeit ausgesetzt ein neues alphabet zu bilden, um darein die gotische sprache zu fassen. Wie das von ihm hergestellte alphabet beweist, war er bekannt mit dem griechischen, dem lateinischen und dem runischen. Von diesen dreien wählte er, wie Wimmer glaubt, das griechische zur grundlage des neu zu schaffenden und verwarf somit das runenalphabet, dessen die Goten sich bis dahin bedient hatten, wenigstens in inschriften<sup>1</sup> und, when wir das zeugniss des Jordanes als vollwertig ansehen, auch in der niederschrift ihrer gesetze,<sup>2</sup> denn bei Jordanes heisst

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. *Grd.*<sup>1</sup>, I, s. 408, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. *Grd.*<sup>1</sup>, II, ss. 66 f. und anm. 2.

es dass Dicineus die Goten *fysicam tradens naturaliter propriis legibus vivere fecit, quas usque nunc conscriptas belagines* (got. \*bilageinōs) *nuncupant*.

Wimmer gesteht dem gotischen runenalphabet nur insofern einfluss zu, als Wulfila demselben seine zeichen für *o* und *u* entnahm und aus ihm auch die namen der buchstaben auf das von ihm gebildete alphabet übertrug. Es unterliegt nun keinem zweifel, dass Wimmers schlüsse mit bezug auf die directen quellen der einzelnen buchstaben richtig sind, "dass Wulfila sein alphabet durch aufnahme griechischer und lateinischer buchstaben gebildet hat, ohne etwas in deren form zu ändern" (s. 269). Und dass Wulfila bei der wahl derselben in der weise hätte vorgehen können, wie Wimmer annimmt, ist auch möglich, dass er aber in wirklichkeit so ans werk ging, scheint ausserst unwahrscheinlich zu sein, und auf diese unwahrscheinlichkeit sollen die im folgenden gegebenen bemerkungen über das Wulfilanische alphabet hinweisen.

Gleich zu anfang sollte erwähnt werden, dass Wulfilas eklektische methode in der bildung des neuen alphabets, indem er seine buchstaben verschiedenen quellen entnahm und die einzelnen zeichen wegen ihrer fähigkeit gewisse laute auszudrücken und aus anderen weniger wichtigen gründen auswählte, in der geschichte der alphabete ganz ohne parallele dasteht. Es ist allgemein bekannt, dass das lateinische alphabet in späterer zeit von allen andern germanischen völkern angenommen und dazu gezwungen wurde, die laute der verschiedenen dialekte zu repräsentieren, wenn auch mit mehr oder weniger ungenauigkeit. Wo sich das lateinische alphabet als gänzlich ungenügend erwies, schuf man neue buchstabenverbindungen wie *uu = w*,<sup>1</sup> *dh = ð*, *th = þ* oder behielt einzelne zeichen aus dem alten alphabet bei wie beim ags. *þ*.<sup>2</sup> Es könnte hier nun eingewendet werden, dass die sache anders liegt, wenn ein einzelner ein neues alphabet schafft, als wenn ein fremdes alphabet sich langsam unter einem anderen volke bahn bricht. Aber auch hierzu lässt sich eine parallele finden, die gegen das dem bischof der goten zugeschriebene verfahren spricht. Ich brauche nur auf das altbulgarische alphabet hinzuweisen,

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, *Ahd. gram.*, § 7 a 2.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. SIEVERS, *Ags. gram.*, § 4.

welches auch das werk eines einzigen mannes ist und geschaffen wurde unter bedingungen denen ganz ähnlich, unter welchen das gotische alphabet zu stande kam, nämlich um zur übersetzung der bibel in die sprache des volkes zu dienen.

In den gerade angeführten alphabeten, dem althochdeutschen, angelsächsischen und altbulgarischen, war die zur schriftlichen wiedergabe der einzelnen laute nötige analyse derselben gegründet auf der analyse der laute des lateinischen und griechischen, wie dieselben durch die buchstaben ihrer alphabete dargestellt waren. Im allgemeinen lässt sich überhaupt sagen, dass ein alphabet nur insofern die grundlage eines andern sein kann, als die analyse der zu fixierenden laute des letzteren auf der lautanalyse des ersteren sich gründet. Das bewusstsein der lautwerte selbst und der notwendigkeit, sie im schriftlichen bilde festzuhalten, ergibt sich erst aus dem schon bestehenden alphabete. Geringere abweichungen bei den wiederzugebenden lauten von dem ursprünglichen werte der gebrauchten buchstaben werden manchmal ausser acht gelassen und deshalb mag es vorkommen, dass derselbe buchstabe zwei verschiedene laute repräsentiert. Spätere differenzierung kann durch modifikation der ursprünglichen buchstaben erzielt werden oder durch neue verbindungen. Wenn, wie im falle der germanischen sprachen, ein fremdes alphabet ein schon bestehendes verdrängt, so mögen buchstaben aus dem älteren in dem neu aufgenommenen beibehalten werden, aber nur, wie z. b. bei dem ags. *ƿ*, um laute zu bezeichnen, die in der andern sprache nicht vorhanden waren.

Indem wir uns nun zu Wulfilas alphabet zurückwenden, wollen wir zuerst die gründe untersuchen, durch die Wimmer zu erklären sucht, warum Wulfila von dem griechischen alphabet, welches er doch als grundlage für das gotische benutzt haben soll, abwich, was also das charakteristische merkmal seiner arbeitsweise war bei der schaffung eines neuen alphabets im unterschiede von der art und weise, wie dies gewöhnlich geschieht.

Wir finden in Wulfilas alphabet fünf buchstaben für laute, die im griechischen nicht vorkommen: *Q* und *Y* für die halbvokale *j* und *w*, *u* für den stimmlosen labiogutturalen explosivlaut *q*, *θ* für den stimmlosen labialisierten gutturalen spiranten *h* und *h*

im werthe eines spiritus asper und des stimmlosen gutturalen spiranten  $\chi$ , für welche beiden im griechischen nicht bloss ein zeichen benutzt wird. Es gelingt Wimmer nicht, klar darzuthun, wie Wulfila zur kenntniss dieser laute gelangte, oder vielmehr, wie sich ihm die notwendigkeit einer bezeichnung dieser laute aufdrängte. Wie schon oben angedeutet wurde, gelangen wir zum bewusstsein eines lautes durch die kenntnis der laute des alphabets, welches als grundlage des neu zu schaffenden dient. Nun kommen die halbvokale  $j$  und  $w$  (auch der spirant) nicht vor in dem griechischen des vierten jahrhunderts und im lateinischen werden sie in der schrift nicht unterschieden von den vokalen  $i$  und  $u$  (lat.  $u$  und  $w$  werden im griechischen wiedergegeben durch  $ou$ , resp.  $\beta$ ). Diese alphabete hatten Wulfila deshalb nicht die notwendigkeit nahe legen können, zwischen den halbvokalen und vokalen zu unterscheiden, nach dem lateinischen würden wir erwarten  $u$  und  $w = u$ , etc. In übereinstimmung mit seiner theorie über die art und weise, wie Wulfila bei der schaffung seines alphabets vorging, scheint nun Wimmer zu glauben, dass Wulfila diese notwendigkeit ganz unabhängig von äusseren anstössen erkannte. Aber abgesehen davon, dass sich eine derartige schaffung eines alphabets nur mit den phonetischen systemen der neuzeit vergleichen liesse, wird die ansicht schon dadurch als unhaltbar erwiesen, dass diese unterscheidung schon im runenalphabet bestand  $\mathfrak{A}^h$ ,  $\mathfrak{U}^p$ , mit dem der gotenbischof wohl ebenso gut bekannt war als mit dem griechischen, und wahrscheinlich bekannter als mit dem lateinischen. Es lässt sich deshalb der schluss ziehen, dass Wulfila in der unterscheidung der halbvokale von den vokalen dem runenalphabet folgte.

Die labialisierten gutturale,  $u = q$  und  $\theta = hv$ , kommen im griechischen nicht vor, noch gelangte Wulfila zu einer kenntnis derselben vermitteltst des lateinischen. Wenn auch der erste dieser beiden laute im lateinischen des 3. oder 4. jahrh. zu finden ist, so wird er doch regelmässig durch  $qu$  vertreten. Wenn nun Wulfila seine kenntnis des lautes durch das lateinische erlangt hätte, so wäre, wie mir scheint, kein grund vorhanden gewesen, warum er den gotischen laut nicht durch  $qu$  oder wenigstens  $q$  hätte wiedergeben können. Es ist nur ein notbehelf, wenn



Wimmer sagt,<sup>1</sup> dass Wulfila das lateinische *u* und nicht *q* zur wiedergabe des lautes deshalb wählte, weil das ihm entsprechende zeichen im griechischen schon als zahlzeichen im gebrauch war.

Die durch **u** und **o** bezeichneten gotischen laute waren in wirklichkeit einfache laute.<sup>2</sup> Wimmer hält diese buchstaben für neugebildete zeichen;<sup>3</sup> das soll wohl heissen, dass Wulfila sie neu erfunden hat. Diese laute müssen aber schon im gotischen runenalphabet eine bezeichnung gehabt haben. Wenn jeder derselben durch zwei runen wiedergegeben wurde, d. h. durch **< þ** und **h þ**, wie Wimmer unausgesprochen anzunehmen scheint, so ist es schwer zu erklären, wie Wulfila zu den einfachen zeichen **u** und **o** kam, da **u y** und **h y** seinem zweck ebenso gut würden entsprochen haben. Er vermied nicht die doppelzeichen für einfache laute, was bewiesen wird durch den gebrauch von **al** und **an** für *ē* und *ō*, und der unterschied zwischen labialisirtem *h* oder stimmlosem *w*, d. h. *hw*, und *h + w*, oder zwischen dem labialisirten *k*, d. h. *q*, und *k + w* ist so gering, dass man Wulfila schon für einen fachmännisch gebildeten phonetiker halten muss, um die annahme zu rechtfertigen, dass er diesen unterschied wahrgenommen habe. Wulfila gelangte wohl nicht zum bewusstsein dieser laute durch das griechische oder lateinische; er muss diese kenntnis vielmehr durch das runenalphabet gewonnen haben, und hier waren *hw* und *q* durch einfache buchstaben bezeichnet, worauf ich an anderer stelle zurückzukommen gedenke.

Es sind jetzt noch die beiden laute, ursprünglich einer, übrig, die durch den einen buchstaben **h** bezeichnet sind. Dieselben konnten nicht einmal annähernd wiedergegeben werden durch einen griechischen buchstaben, denn das zeichen **χ**, welches im späteren altbulgarischen alphabet diese werte besass, stellte zur zeit Wulfilas noch einen aspirierten laut dar, was aus der wiedergabe desselben durch das got. *k* erhellt.<sup>4</sup> Die laute kommen im lateinischen des 4. jahrh. vor, bezeichnet durch das unziale **h**, welches Wulfila benutzte, aber es liegt viel näher die

<sup>1</sup> S. 238.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, *Got. gram.*, §§ 59, 63.

<sup>3</sup> Ss. 261 f., 273 oben.

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, *Got. gram.*, §§ 57.

erkenntnis des lautes im gotischen gerade wie bei den halbvokalen aus dem runenalphabet herzuleiten, das die rune N enthält.

Das bis jetzt gesagte lässt sich also dahin zusammenfassen, dass das runenalphabet Wulfila den wert der laute *j* und *w*, *h* und vielleicht auch *q* und *h* zum bewusstsein brachte.

Warum entlieh nun Wulfila dem lateinischen alphabet die buchstaben **h G ƿ ʀ s u** für sein neues alphabet? Dies führt uns zur betrachtung der von Wimmer angegebenen gründe, wie sie oben angeführt sind. Es sollen nach ihm **h G** aus dem lateinischen ins gotische alphabet aufgenommen sein, weil das griechische keine zeichen für *h* und *j* darbot, keine diesen lauten entsprechenden buchstaben besass. Im falle des erstgenannten lautes bot das lateinische den verlangten buchstaben **h**, aber wie wir oben gesehen haben, ist es wahrscheinlich, dass Wulfila durch die rune N zur erkenntnis des gotischen lautes kam, und dieses runenzeichen ist fast identisch mit lat. kapitälem H, welches im 4. jahrh. ebenso gut bekannt war wie sein abkömmling, das unziale *h*. Der grund dafür, dass Wulfila das unziale *h* dem kapitälen vorzog, war der umstand, dass er ein unziales alphabet herstellte. Es ist somit auch hier kein weiter sprung zur annahme, dass Wulfila sich in seiner wahl des buchstabens beeinflusst fühlte durch die ähnlichkeit des lateinischen buchstabens mit der entsprechenden rune.

Was den zweiten gotischen laut, den halbvokal *j*, anbetrifft, so bot das lateinische den buchstaben *i* mit entsprechendem werte, aber Wulfila verwarf denselben, weil er, wie schon gesagt, einen unterschied machen wollte zwischen vokal und halbvokal, wie dieser im runenalphabet existierte. Es scheint ziemlich unsicher zu sein, ob im 4. jahrh. *g* vor hellen vokalen palatalisiert oder vielmehr spirantisiert war oder nicht. Ob es nun, wie Lindsay<sup>1</sup> annimmt, in dieser stellung noch verschlusslaut war, oder ob es, wie Seelmann<sup>2</sup> anzugeben scheint durch seine bezeichnung desselben als praepalatal und gingival, sich *dj* näherte, so war es doch in keinem falle eine genaue darstellung des gotischen lautes.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> LINDSAY, *The Latin Language*, s. 85.

<sup>2</sup> SEELMANN, *Die aussprache des latein.*, etc., s. 336.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, *Got. gram.*, § 43

Diese erwägungen lassen es als höchst wahrscheinlich erscheinen, dass Wulfila den lateinischen buchstaben **G** deshalb in sein alphabet aufnahm, weil er der rune **h** so ähnlich war.

Nach Wimmer nahm Wulfila lat. *f* auf, weil der lateinische buchstabe den gotischen laut genauer wiedergab als griech. *φ*: "das lateinische *f* stand dem gotischen laut viel näher als das griechische *φ*" (s. 266), "die aussprache des griechischen *φ* und des gotischen *f* war wesentlich verschieden" (s. 263). Wimmer lässt sich nicht näher darüber aus, worin diese grössere abweichung des griechischen *φ* vom gotischen laute bestand, und es will fast scheinen, als ob die aussere übereinstimmung des Wulfilanischen mit dem lateinischen buchstaben der hauptgrund für seine ansicht sei. Got. *f* war höchstwahrscheinlich ein bilabialer spirant.<sup>1</sup> Jelineks theorie, dass es labiodental gewesen,<sup>2</sup> beruht einzig auf Wimmers oben citierter annahme und ist schon durch formen wie *fiuf*, *hamfs*, widerlegt. Lat. *f* war schon im 4. jahrh. labiodental;<sup>3</sup> griech. *φ* war zu dieser zeit unzweifelhaft bilabial und wahrscheinlich ein spirant, was z. b. auch durch Wulfilas wiedergabe desselben in eigennamen vermittelt *f* bewiesen wird. Wenn auch wegen unzureichender beweis die möglichkeit zugegeben werden müsste, dass es noch aspiriert war, so beweist doch Wulfilas vorgehen, indem er griech. *φ* durch got. *f* wiedergiebt, dass er den unterschied nicht für bedeutend hielt, während Wimmers theorie das bemerken eines solchen unterschiedes voraussetzt. Wenn Wulfila die aspirata *φ* vermied und den spiranten *f* anwendete, warum folgte er dann nicht dem lateinischen brauch und gab griech. *προφήτης* durch *prauphetes*, *prauphetus* wieder und nicht durch *praufetes*, *praufetus*, wie er es gethan hat? Die griechische bilabiale aspirata stand dem bilabialen spiranten jedenfalls ebenso nahe wie der labiodentale spirant. Der umstand, der Wulfila in der wahl des lateinischen buchstabens *f* zur wiedergabe des gotischen lautes leitete, war augenscheinlich etwas anderes und zwar die ausserordentliche ähnlichkeit des lateinischen **F** mit der rune **f**.

<sup>1</sup> BRAUNE, *Got. gram.*, § 52; WREDE, *Die sprache der Ostgoten*, s. 169.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeitchr. f. d. Alt.*, Bd. XXXVI, ss. 275 f.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. SEELMANN, *Ausspr. d. Lat.*, s. 295; LINDSAY, *The Lat. Lang.*, s. 98.

Lat. R und S wurden nach Wimmers ansicht aufgenommen "weil mit griech. P und C zwei lateinische buchstaben mit einer ganz verschiedenen bedeutung formell zusammenfielen. Indem er die lateinischen formen für r und s aufnahm, erreichte Wulfila somit, dass sein alphabet kein zeichen bekam, das im griechischen und lateinischen verschiedene bedeutung hatte."<sup>1</sup> Aber Wulfila stellte sein alphabet nicht für die Römer her, sondern für die Goten. Auch ist hier zu beachten, dass Wulfila griech.  $\theta$  und  $\psi$  und lat. u mit ganz anderem lautwert in sein alphabet aufnahm als der es war, den sie in ihren eigenen alphabeten besaßen, von griech.  $\epsilon = \bar{e}$  ganz zu schweigen. Der grund für Wulfilas wahl ist unzweifelhaft der von Kirchhoff<sup>2</sup> angegebene, dem auch Wimmer einigen wert zugesteht, dass nämlich latein. r und s den entsprechenden runenzeichen weit näher lagen als die griechischen buchstaben.

Als resultat ergibt sich somit bis dahin wenigstens die wahrscheinlichkeit, dass von den sechs lateinischen buchstaben, die Wulfila für sein alphabet auswählte, fünf aufgenommen wurden wegen ihrer grossen ähnlichkeit mit den entsprechenden runen.

Es erübrigt noch den einen lateinischen buchstaben u im werte von q zu behandeln; jedenfalls hat Wulfila ihn dem lateinischen nicht entliehen, weil er den gotischen laut genau repräsentierte. Auch hier ist, wie ich später zu zeigen gedenke, die wahl des buchstabens der ähnlichkeit desselben mit der entsprechenden rune zuzuschreiben. Wo also Wulfila vom griechischen alphabet abwich, entweder in der bezeichnung von lauten, die im griechischen nicht vorkamen, oder in der entlehnung von buchstaben aus einem anderen alphabet, dem lateinischen, wurde er in dieser wahl geleitet durch rücksichten auf das runenalphabet.

Wulfilas bezeichnung der gotischen vokale ist hauptsächlich ausschlaggebend gegen Wimmers ansicht. Wenn Wulfilas alphabet auf dem griechischen beruht, so ist es äusserst schwierig zu verstehen, warum die runen ᚱ und ᚷ gewählt wurden, da das griechische alphabet genaue bezeichnungen dieser laute in  $\alpha$  und  $\omega$  besass. Was u betrifft, so lässt sich nicht einwenden, dass Wulfila den digraph für einen einzellaut zu vermeiden wünschte,

<sup>1</sup> Ss. 296 f.

<sup>2</sup> Kirchhoff, *Das got. runenalphabet*, ss. 55 f.  
465

denn er braucht auch sonst zwei buchstaben zur bezeichnung eines solchen lautes, *ei* = *ī*, *at* = *ē*, *au* = *ō*. Wimmer scheint das gewicht solcher einwendungen zu fühlen, denn er giebt keine genügenden gründe an für den gebrauch von **ñ** und **œ**:

Ich bin nicht im zweifel darüber, dass Wulfila beim *o*- wie beim *u*-zeichen das griechische (und lateinische) alphabet verlassen und die alte heimische schrift benutzt hat, die gerade betreffs dieser beiden zeichen insofern vorzüglich zu seiner eigenen passte, als sie besonders bequem zu schreiben waren. Diese letztere rücksicht, glaube ich, ist auch die einzige ausschlaggebende für Wulfila gewesen (s. 270).

Über Wulfilas bezeichnung der gotischen *e*- und *o*-laute lässt er sich anderswo, s. 262, auch so aus:

Einen dem griechischen entsprechenden unterschied zwischen *ε* und *η*, *ο* und *ω* hielt Wulfila für überflüssig; sein *e* (d. i. *ē*) setzte er an die stelle des griechischen *ε*, sein *o* (d. i. *ō*) umgekehrt an die des griechischen *ω*, und bekam somit platz für *h* und *u*, wo das griechische *η* und *ο* hatte. Aber im zweitnächsten satze konstatiert Wimmer im widerspruch mit dem gerade citierten grund:

Dagegen hat er in ein paar anderen fällen gerade mit dem griechischen als vorbild einzellaute durch zusammenstellung von zwei zeichen ausgedrückt, indem er *ī* durch *ei* und *œ* durch *ai* bezeichnete.<sup>1</sup>

Ob Wulfila nun an den unterschied in der quantität dachte oder an den in der qualität, wie Sievers vorschlägt,<sup>2</sup> gewiss ist es, dass er in der schrift unterschied zwischen den langen geschlossenen lauten *ē*, *ō*, *ī* und den kurzen offenen *ě*, *ǫ*, *ī*, und dieser unterschied bildet einen der hauptvorteile, den das Wulfilanische alphabet vor dem später von den andern germanischen völkern angenommenen lateinischen hatte.

Weiter beabsichtigt Wimmer wohl kaum in der oben citierten ansicht anzudeuten, dass griech. *ε* und *η*, *ο* und *ω* zu Wulfilas zeit keinen unterschied zwischen den kurzen offenen und langen geschlossenen lauten bezeichneten. Unser verlässlichster beweis für den wert griechischer buchstaben, womit Wulfila bekannt war, ist seine transcription griechischer eigennamen. Hier wird regelmässig griech. *η* durch got. *e*, d. h. langes geschlossenes *ē*,<sup>3</sup> wie-

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. auch s. 271 oben.

<sup>2</sup> Grd.<sup>1</sup> I, s. 410, § 4.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, *Got. gram.*, § 6, a 1. Got. *i*, *ei* für *η*, Br. Gr. § 7, a 1-4; § 16, a 1, sind ostgotischen schreibern zuzuschreiben; WEEDE, *Über die Sprache der Ostgoten in Italien*, s. 161. *ai* = *η*; Br., Gr. § 23, a 1, ist herbeigeführt durch substitution eines kurzen lautes für einen langen, gerade wie got. *e* dann und wann anstatt des griech. *ε* erscheint, Br. Gr., § 6, a 1.

dergegeben, griech.  $\epsilon$  durch got.  $ai$ , d. h. kurzes offenes  $\ddot{e}$ ,<sup>1</sup> griech.  $\omega$  durch got.  $\bar{o}$ , d. h. langes geschlossenes  $\bar{o}$ ,<sup>2</sup> und griech.  $o$  durch got.  $au$ , d. h. kurzes offenes  $\ddot{o}$ ,<sup>3</sup> oder  $u$  in unbetonten silben. Blass<sup>4</sup> kommt aus anderen beweisgründen zu demselben schluss mit bezug auf den wert von griech.  $\epsilon$  und  $\eta$  im 4. jahrh.

Da es wohl kaum zu bezweifeln ist, dass die gotischen  $e$ -,  $o$ -laute den griechischen  $e$ -,  $o$ -lauten entsprachen, sehen wir uns vor die frage gestellt: warum machte Wulfila keinen gebrauch von den buchstaben  $\epsilon$  und  $\eta$ ,  $o$  und  $\omega$  in der bezeichnung der gotischen laute? Was  $\epsilon$  und  $H$  betrifft, liesse sich darauf antworten, dass Wulfila schon den dem  $H$  entsprechenden lateinischen buchstaben gebraucht hatte, um stimmlose gutturale spirans zu bezeichnen, was die frage nach der priorität in der behandlung von  $\bar{e}$  und  $h$  aufwerfen würde. Zugegeben aber, dass Wulfila sich entschloss, got.  $h$  durch lat. unziales  $h$  wiederzugeben, das würde ihn kaum daran gehindert haben, auch gebrauch zu machen von der form  $H$ , die im 4. jahrh. gang und gäbe war, und der unterschied zwischen  $h$  und  $H$  wäre immer noch grösser gewesen als der zwischen  $k$  und  $P$  oder zwischen  $\lambda$  und  $\Lambda$ . Was nun weiter langes und kurzes  $o$  betrifft, so ist vom standpunkte des griechischen alphabets aus absolut kein grund vorhanden, warum Wulfila sich nicht hätte der buchstaben  $\omega$  und  $o$  bedienen sollen anstatt der rune  $\mathfrak{A}$  und der buchstabenverbindung  $au$ , welch letztere im griechischen nicht im werte von  $\ddot{o}$  im gebrauch war und entweder nach der analogie von  $ai=\ddot{e}$  gebildet oder dem lateinischen entnommen sein muss.

Der grund für diese lage der dinge ist im runenalphabet und in der entwicklung des gotischen zu suchen. Die rune  $\mathfrak{M}$  repräsentierte ursprünglich langes und kurzes  $e$ ; als aber kurzes  $e$  in der vorwulfilanischen periode zu  $i$  wurde, behielt  $\mathfrak{M}$  nur den wert von langem  $\bar{e}$ . Wie nun später  $i$  zu kurzem offenem  $e$  gebrochen wurde, fand dieser laut erst spezielle bezeichnung durch Wulfila, der den griechischen digraph  $ai$  dazu benutzte. Es war also in dem Wulfila bekannten runenalphabet nur ein zeichen für den  $e$ -laut vorhanden und dies bezeichnete den langen geschlossenen

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. BRAUNE, Gr. § 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, § 11, a 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, § 24, a 5; § 13, a 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Aussprache des griech.*<sup>3</sup> § 11.

laut. Zur darstellung desselben wählt nun Wulfila nicht das runenzeichen, welches mit griech. M zusammengefallen wäre, sondern verkehrterweise griech. ε, welches aber im lateinischen mit dem doppelten werte im gebrauch war. Der umstand, dass griech. H mit der rune N hätte verwechselt werden können, mag ihn auch beeinflusst haben. Ähnlicherweise besass ʀ einzig den wert eines langen ō und das gotische gebrochene o < u wurde in der runenschrift wahrscheinlich nicht unterschieden von kurzem offenem u, und Wulfila gebraucht auch hier eine buchstabenverbindung, auf deren ursprung schon oben hingewiesen ist.

Diese beobachtungen, zu denen andere hinzutreten sollen, über die Wulfila von Wimmer zugeschriebene eklektische methode in der schaffung seines alphabets; über die art und weise, wie er zum bewusstsein des lautwertes kam, den die schriftlich wiederzugebenden laute hatten; einerseits über die gründe, die ihn nach Wimmer dazu gebracht haben sollen, vom griechischen alphabet abzuweichen, und andererseits über die ähnlichkeit der dem lateinischen entlehnten buchstaben mit den entsprechenden runen; über seine bezeichnung der vokale sollen darauf hinweisen, dass Wimmer's satz, s. 262, "dass das griechische alphabet somit die grundlage bildet für das Wulfilanische, ist über jeden zweifel erhaben," doch vielleicht anfechtbar ist und möchten dazu dienen, die frage nach der grundlage des gotischen alphabets noch einmal anzuregen.

ERNST H. MENSEL.

SMITH COLLEGE.



## THE USE OF *ELLA*, *LEI*, AND *LA* AS POLITE FORMS OF ADDRESS IN ITALIAN.

### I. DATE OF THE INTRODUCTION OF *ELLA*, *LEI*, AND *LA* AS POLITE FORMS OF ADDRESS.

THE latest treatment of this question is that of Meyer-Lübke, who says:

La Troisième Personne employée par politesse au lieu de la Deuxième, au Singulier comme au Pluriel, se rencontre en Italie, en Espagne et en Portugal. En italien, le nom de la personne à qui l'on s'adresse est remplacé à l'origine par *Vossignoria*, qui peut naturellement à son tour être suppléé par le pronom correspondant: *ella* ou *lei*, forme qui apparaît au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle et qui s'étend rapidement, au point qu'elle est la seule usitée aujourd'hui dans les classes élevées de la société.<sup>1</sup>

Abstract substantives were already used as forms of address in late Latin. Schmalz says that *sancitas tua*<sup>2</sup> was used in addressing bishops from the end of the fourth century. In the early Italian monuments *vostra Signoria*<sup>3</sup> was used regularly in formal address, but was never repeated by *ella*. The first occurrence of this pronoun used in address in the texts consulted is found in Giovanni Fiorentino,<sup>4</sup> who wrote in 1378. In this text *le*, the dative of *ella*, refers directly to *santità* and is translated "to you." The use of *ella* for *voi* began in constructions like this, where the noun to which it referred stood immediately before it.<sup>5</sup> Later,

<sup>1</sup> *Grammaire des Langues Romanes* (Paris, 1900), Vol. III, ¶ 95; compare also BLANC, *Grammatik der italienischen Sprache* (Halle, 1844), p. 273.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. MÜLLER's *Handbuch* (München, 1890), Vol. II, p. 535d.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. BLANC, *op. cit.*, p. 274 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Il Pecorone*, 10, 1: "Avenne che passeggiando loro per Roma, furono dalla donna conosciuti, l'uno per fratello (perchè il padre fra queste mezzo era morto) e l'altro per marito; ed ella presentandosi davanti al papa, gli disse: Beatissimo padre, vostra santità sa che io mai non le ho voluto manifestare di chi sieno nati questi figliuoli, ne ch'io mi sia."

<sup>5</sup> For a similar construction in French, compare LA FONTAINE, *Fables*, I, 10:

Sire, répond l'agneau, que votre majesté  
Ne se mette pas en colère;  
Mais plutôt qu'elle considère  
Que je me vas désaltérant  
Dans le courant  
Plus de vingt pas au-dessous d'elle.

Compare also *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, II, 9: "Monseigneur, nous la remercions très humblement de ses libéralités."

however, the noun was omitted and *ella* came to be looked upon as the regular form of polite address.

The use of *lei* and *la* as subject forms in polite address dates from the sixteenth century. Giovanni della Casa<sup>1</sup> uses *la* for *ella* in address frequently, while Benvenuto Cellini<sup>2</sup> uses *lei* for *ella* once in his letters.

## II. AGREEMENT OF PAST PARTICIPLES AND ADJECTIVES MODIFYING *ELLA*, *LEI*, AND *LA* USED AS POLITE FORMS OF ADDRESS.

1. Blanc,<sup>3</sup> reviewing the statements of the older grammarians on this point, says:

Manche grammatiker<sup>4</sup> sind auch dieser meinung, dass man sagen müsse: voi oder ella (uomo) siete oder è troppo timido; oder voi, ella (donna) siete oder è troppo timida, und ebenso im plural, wenn mehrere männer oder frauen angeredet werden. Andere<sup>5</sup> verlangen dagegen, dass das adjectiv oder participium sich nach dem ella richten solle: ella si è degnata, auch wenn man mit einem manne spricht. Wieder andere<sup>6</sup> behaupten: wenn die hülfsverba *essere* and *avere* allein im satze ständen. dann müsse sich das adjectiv oder pronomen nach dem ella richten, z. b. Ella (signore) era molto affitta, io l'ho ringraziata più volte. Wenn man sich aber eines anderen verbums bediene, dann richte sich das adjectiv oder participium nach dem wirklichen geschlecht des angeredeten: Ella si mostra sempre disinvolto e spassionato. Noch andere<sup>7</sup> geben die regel: wenn das verbum *essere* als hülfswort stehe, so müsse das participium sich nach ella richten, die folgenden adjective aber nach dem wirklichen geschlecht der angeredeten person, also Ella (Signore) si è mostrata non meno savio che benigno; und wenn man

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 46: "E tanto più me le sento obbligato, quanto io mi rendo sicuro, che quella parte della grazia, che il Sig. Duca ha fatta per reverenza di N. Sig. sarà più stabile in ogni caso per il rispetto, e per gli obblighi, che S. Ecc. ha a V. Sig. Illustriss. come io veggio per la copia della Lettera, che *La* si è degnata di farmi mandare;" p. 50: "Solo le dico, ch'io mi sforzerò d'esser tale, che *La* non abbia mai cagione di pentirsi dell' onorato giudicio, che *La* si è degnata fare di me."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. VIII: "Non d'altro gonflesso la supplico, se non che mi facci degno di risposta, avendomene più e più volte fatto degno papi, lo imperatore e uno così gran re; *Lei* degna e santa, a loro eguale, mi faccia degno della sua grazia: quale Iddio lunghissima e felicissima conservi.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 276.

<sup>4</sup> FERNOW, *Italiänische Sprachlehre für Deutsche* (Tübingen, 1804), p. 546; MINNIE, *Wissenschaftliche Sprachlehre* (Frankfurt a/M, 1830), p. 120.

<sup>5</sup> FRANCESCO SOAVE, *Grammatica Ragionata della Lingua Italiana* (Milano, 1816), p. 185.

<sup>6</sup> VALENTINI, *Italiänischer Lehrer* (Leipzig, 1827), Vol. II, p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> GALIGNANI, *Grammar and Exercises in 24 Lectures on the Italian Language* (London, 1794), p. 61.

im plural sich der worte Le Signorie loro bediene, so müssen die adjective sich nach diesen worten richten: Le Signorie loro son molto dotte.

Aus allen diesen, zum theil sich widersprechenden regeln lässt sich das resultat ziehen, dass, wenn in sehr förmlicher, oder auch sehr unterwürfiger rede jemand sich der titulaturen *Vostra Signoria*, oder *Eccelessenza*, *Paternità* und ähnlicher bedient, er dann auch die adjective auf diese titel beziehen müsse; während man im gemeinen leben, im gespräch, in briefen, etc., ohne rücksicht auf das vorangehende *ella*, die adjective und participien mit dem wirklichen geschlecht der angesprochenen Person übereinstimmen lässt.

## 2. Of the grammarians of today Grandgent says:

The usual form of address in Italy is *Ella* (or *ella*), objective *Lei* (or *lei*); in conversation *Ella* is replaced by *Lei* (or *lei*). This word really means "it," and takes the verb in the third person; but an adjective or past participle modifying it agrees in gender with the person it represents.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, Sauer says:

The polite mode *Ella* (*Lei*) being always considered feminine, all *adjectives* and *participles*, even when belonging to masculine nouns, should agree with it. This rule is often neglected.<sup>2</sup>

Throughout his grammar Sauer<sup>3</sup> writes the feminine forms of *adjectives* and *participles* relating to *ella* or *lei*.

The résumé given below will show how this construction is represented in the texts examined for this study:

1. Past participle modifying *ella*, *lei*, or *la* is feminine when the person addressed is masculine:<sup>4</sup> D<sup>5</sup> rule, E<sup>6</sup> rule, F<sup>7</sup> rule, G<sup>8</sup> rule, H<sup>9</sup> rule, I<sup>10</sup> rule, K<sup>11</sup> rule, N<sup>12</sup> rule, Q.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Italian Grammar* (Boston, 1891), p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Italian Conversation-Grammar* (New York, 1899), p. 60 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. SAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 60: "E Lei (uomo), quando è nata?"

<sup>4</sup> Cf. E (*Lettere*), p. 24: "Io ringrazio V. Ecc. Illustriss. quanto posso, ch'ella si sia degnata di ricevere il Sig. Annibale con tanta benignità;" H, p. 2: "Io dunque, come sue, quali elle si siano (poi che non mi è permesso di farle dono di cose mie, e maggiori) gliele offero, et appresento, pregrandola a restar compiaciuta di gradirle con così lieta fronte, e così giocondo viso, come io divotamente gliele dedico."

<sup>5</sup> Cf. p. 305.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. E, pp. 15, 20, 24, 30, 31, 42, 43, 48, 50, 52, 57 (*Lettere*); 135 (*Orazione*).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. p. 151.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. XXV.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. p. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *La Locandiera*, I, 5; II, 6, 13; III, 4. Compare also *Le Smanie per la Villeggiatura*, I, 1, 2, 4; III, 2, 3, 8.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. chap. 5, p. 68.

2. Adjective modifying *ella*, *lei*, or *la* is feminine when the person addressed is masculine:<sup>1</sup> D<sup>2</sup> rule, E<sup>3</sup> rule, G<sup>4</sup> rule.

3. Past participle modifying *ella*, *lei*, *la* is masculine when the person addressed is masculine:<sup>5</sup> Q<sup>6</sup> rule, R rule, S<sup>7</sup> rule, U<sup>8</sup> rule.

4. Adjective modifying *ella*, *lei*, *la* is masculine when the person addressed is masculine:<sup>9</sup> N<sup>10</sup> rule, Q<sup>11</sup> rule, R<sup>12</sup> rule, S<sup>13</sup> rule.

The grammarians who have discussed the agreement of adjectives and past participles modifying *ella*, *lei*, and *la* used as polite forms of address have not treated the question historically. They have merely attempted to state the usage at the time at which they write. From the résumé given above we are able to determine to some extent the historical development of this construction. From this table it will be seen that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both the adjective and past participle were feminine when modifying *ella*, *lei*, or *la* used in address. In the eighteenth century the participle still retains its feminine form in such constructions, while the adjective is masculine or feminine according to the gender of the person addressed. Goldoni, writing about the middle of the century, uses the feminine participle and the masculine adjective when the person addressed is masculine. In *I Promessi Sposi*,<sup>14</sup> which was

<sup>1</sup> E (*Lettere*), p. 28: "La qual grazia io riporrò con gli altri favori ricevuti da lei; alla quale bacio la mano, pregando N. Sig. Dio, che felicissima la conservi;" G, IX: "Molto mio divinissimo patrone, io la prego che sia contenta di farmi pagare la gabella del podere."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 306.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Lettere*, pp. 15, 27, 28, 30, 34.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. VIII, IX, XIV, XVII, XVIII.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. U, p. 45: "Bisogna addirittura che lei, professore, faccia di tutto perchè la mia Albertina non vada quest'anno a villeggiare dalla baronessa . . . non c'è che lei che possa persuaderla . . . e forse lei ci riuscirà, . . . è stato suo maestro; S (*Il Maestro di Mio Padre*);" p. 113: "Lei il primo anno, è stato per un pezzo nel primo banco a sinistra vicino alla finestra."

<sup>6</sup> Cf. chap. 5, p. 68.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Il Maestro di Mio Padre*, p. 113.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. p. 45.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. R (*Il Maestro di Calligrafia*), p. 76: "Per carità, professore, non si dia pena per noi,—disse la signora.—Lei è così buono, che siamo venuti a chiederle un favore; S (*La Mia Padrona di Casa*);" p. 101: "Lei se ne torna colla sua famiglia; io, povera vecchia, rimango sola. Si ricordi qualche volta di me che le volevo bene come a un figliuolo. Abbia giudizio; continui a studiare e sarà contento."

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Le Smanie per la Villeggiatura*, I, 12; III, 6. Compare also *La Locandiera*, III, 17, 18.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. chap. 1, p. 19.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Il Maestro di Calligrafia*, p. 76.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Il Maestro di Mio Padre*, p. 113.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. chap. v, p. 68: "Sappiam bene che lei non è venuta al mondo col cappuccio in capo, e che il mondo l'ha conosciuto."

completed in 1822, Manzoni uses a masculine and feminine participle in the same sentence, modifying *lei* and *la* respectively. On the other hand, he writes the masculine form of adjectives when the person addressed is masculine. Since Manzoni I have found only the masculine form of both adjectives and past participles modifying *ella*, *lei*, or *la* used in addressing male beings.<sup>1</sup>

The construction in which the adjective and the past participle take the gender of the person addressed, and not that of the grammatical subject (*ella*, etc.), is doubtless by analogy to the same construction of *voi*. It will be observed that, in the polite form of address, the adjectives and past participle took the gender of the grammatical subject as long as the noun to which *ella*, *lei*, and *la* referred stood immediately before them. For example, in the letters of Bembo, Giovanni della Casa,<sup>2</sup> Annibale Caro, and Benvenuto Cellini,<sup>3</sup> the pronoun of address is always placed near, and associated with, some such ceremonious term as *Sua Eccellenza*. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, when *Sua Eccellenza*, etc., ceased to be expressed (except in rare cases), and the pronouns *ella*, *lei*, and *la* were looked upon as referring directly to the person addressed and not to *Vossignoria*, etc., the adjective began to agree logically, taking the gender of the person addressed. On the other hand, the past participle probably continued to agree with the grammatical subject throughout the eighteenth century, and sporadic examples of such a construction are found at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

A further step toward sense-agreement in the construction in question is the substitution of *egli*<sup>4</sup> for *ella* or *lei*. The only

<sup>1</sup>Cf. S (*Il Maestro di Mio Padre*), p. 113: "(Lei) è stato buono tanto a ricordarsi del suo povero maestro."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. p. 57: "Ma certo V. Sig. mi fa vergognare, lodandomi tanto di soverchio; perciò io la prego, che la moderi il corso dell' amore verso di me, dal quale Ella è stata trasportata troppo oltre termine."

<sup>3</sup>Cf. XVIII: "Onde io molto mi raccomando a V. S. e la prego."

<sup>4</sup>Cf. BOWEN, *First Italian Readings* (Boston, 1897), p. 72: "Il Preside, esternando il suo rammarico per la risoluzione del professore Antonino, gli aveva detto con una gentilezza insolita:—Senza complimenti, professore, se egli non ha voglia di stare in classe tutt' oggi, incarico un altro. Lei ha lavorato pe' suoi giorni abbastanza."

example that I have noted of *egli* used in this sense occurs in Enrico Castelnuevo's *Il Maestro di Calligrafia*.<sup>1</sup>

The tendency for adjectives and past participles to agree logically is also seen in the use of *bestia* and *persona*<sup>2</sup> in early Italian texts. Adjectives modifying *bestia* and *persona*<sup>3</sup> used in the sense of *uomo* were sometimes masculine in Old Italian. One finds the reverse of this construction in the case of French *on* < Latin *homo*. Although *on* is masculine in its origin, a feminine adjective may relate to it, when the sense is clearly feminine.<sup>4</sup>

### III. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- A.—GIOVANNI FIORENTINO: "Il Pecorone," in *Nuova Biblioteca Popolare*, Vol. I (Torino, 1853).  
 B.—ARIOSTO: *Orlando Furioso*, 5 vols. (Milano, 1812).  
 C.—MACHIAVELLI: *Lettere Familiari* (Firenze, 1883).  
 D.—PIETRO BEMBO: *Lettere Scelte* (Milano, 1880), Vol. I, pp. 281–350.  
 E.—GIOVANNI DELLA CASA: (1) "Lettere;" (2) "Orazione Scritta a Carlo V.," in *Opere di Giov. della Casa* (Firenze, 1707).  
 F.—ANNIBAL CARO: "Lettere," in *Apologia, Gli Amori di Dafne e Cloe, Rime* (Milano, 1876), Vol. I, pp. 146–62.  
 G.—BENVENUTO CELLINI: "Lettere e Suppliche," in *I Trattati dell' Oreficeria e della Scultura* (Firenze, 1857), pp. 267–317.  
 H.—ERASMO VIOTTO: "Al<sup>o</sup> Serenissimo Signor Alessandro Farnese Principe di Parma, et di Piacenza," in *La Gierusalemme Liberata overo Il Goffredo del Sig. Torquato Tasso* (Parma, 1581).

<sup>1</sup> For the use of the masculine third person singular as a pronoun of address in French compare VICTOR SCHLIEBITZ, *Die Person der Anrede in der französischen Sprache* (Breslau, 1886), p. 47: "Die andere redeweise, welche statt der 2. p. die 3. p. sing. setzt (wie früher auch im deutschen), soll etwa den umgekehrten sinn ausdrücken, wie die vorige; z. b. Rabelais, IV, 19: Bruder Jean fordert Panurge auf, während des sturmes auf dem schiffe zu helfen:

Vien, pendu au diable, icy nous ayder, de par trente  
 legions de diables, vien: viendra-il? = wirst du kommen?

ebenso IV, 20.

Andere beispiele sind mir nicht bekannt."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. BLANC, *op. cit.*, p. 197: "Erträglicher, doch auch nur bei älteren vorkommend, ist es, wenn das adjectiv sich nicht auf das geschlecht seines hauptwortes, sondern auf die bedeutung desselben bezieht, wie Bocc. 7, 4: Quella bestia (womit ein mann bezeichnet wird) era pur disposto a volere, etc. In Fra Giord. Pred. findet sich die starke licenz: La persona (der mensch) quando e tribolato e ha molta fatica, etc. Erträglicher ist es, wenn es bei Boccaccio heisst: Par persona molto da bene e costumato, für uom da bene."

<sup>3</sup> For the same usage in French compare MOLIÈRE, *Don Juan*, I, 2: "Jamais je n'ai vu deux personnes si contents l'un de l'autre;" *Malade imaginaire*, II, 6: "Deux personnes qui disent les choses d'eux-mêmes." Compare also LITTRÉ, *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, under *personne*.

<sup>4</sup> "On est plus jolie à présent."

<sup>5</sup> Dedicatory Letter (cf. I, J, K).

- I.—GIO. BATTISTA CIOTTI: "Al Serenissimo Principe, Il Signor D. Vincenzo Gonzaga," in *Il Pastor Fido* (Venetia, 1602).
- J.—OTTAVIO MAGNANINI: "Al Serenissimo Signor Don Francesco Maria Feltrio dalla Rovere," in *Filli di Sciro, Favola Pastorale del Conte Guido Ubaldo Bonarelli* (Ferrara, 1607).
- K.—"Agl' Ill. ed. Eccell. SS. LI SS. Giovacchimernesto, Giovancasimiro, e Cristiano Principi d'Analt, Conti d' Ascania di Servesta, e di Berneborgo, miei Signori," in *Tre trattati d'Albertano Guidice da Brescia* (Firenze, 1610).
- L.—FANTOZZI PARMA: "Diario del Viaggio Fatto in Inghilterra nel 1639 dal Nunzio Pontificio Rossetti, scritto da Domenico Fantozzi, Parma," pub. by PROF. GIUSEPPE FERRARO, in *Scelta, ecc.*, CCXII (Bologna, 1885).
- M.—SCIPIONE MAFFEI: *Merope* (Boston, 1890; pub. by Librairie Hachette et C<sup>o</sup>, London, Paris, Boston).
- N.—CARLO GOLDONI: (1) *Teatro Italiano Scelto* (Parigi, 1855); (2) *La Locandiera*, ed. by J. GEDDES AND F. M. JOSSELYN (Boston, 1901); (3) *Un Curioso Accidente*, ed. by J. D. M. FORD (Boston, 1899).
- O.—PIETRO METASTASIO: *Opere* (Firenze, 1819), Vol. I, pp. 1-84, "Didone Abbandonata;" Vol. XIII.
- P.—VITTORIO ALFIERI: (1) *Opere Scelte* (Milano, 1818), Vol. I, pp. 118-76, "Antigone;" (2) *Opere di Vitt. A.* (Padova, 1809), Vol. VI, pp. 1-94, "Saul."
- Q.—ALESSANDRO MANZONI: *I Promessi Sposi* (Milano, 1900).
- R.—ENRICO CASTELNUOVO: (1) "In Teorema di Pitagora," in *Modern Italian Readings*, by W. L. MONTAGUE, PH.D. (Boston, 1893); (2) "Il Maestro di Calligrafia," in *First Italian Readings*, by BENJAMIN LESTER BOWEN, PH.D. (Boston, 1897).
- S.—EDMONDO DE AMICIS: (1) "La Mia Padrona di Casa," in *First Italian Readings*, by B. L. BOWEN (Boston, 1897), pp. 94-102; (2) "Il Maestro di Mio Padre," in *Il Cuore*, ed. by L. OSCAR KUHN (New York, 1896), pp. 109-20; (3) "Naufragio," *ibid.*, pp. 176-84.
- T.—MATILDE SERAO: *Dal Vero* (Milano, 1890).
- U.—ROSALIA PIATTI: "Veni, Vidi . . . Non Vici," in *First Italian Readings*, by B. L. BOWEN (Boston, 1897), pp. 43-48.

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY.